

5381. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of National Employees' Union No. 1, of the National Federation of Federal Employees, of San Francisco, Calif., urging that all civil positions be placed under the regulations of the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

5382. Also, petition of California Federation of Post Office Clerks regarding salaries of post-office employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

5383. Also, petition of Los Angeles (Calif.) Farm Bureau, urging a protective tariff on the walnut industry of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5384. Also, petition of Birdsall Olive Co., of East Auburn, Calif., urging a protective tariff on olives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5385. Also, petition of Mount Lassen Post, No. 167, American Legion, Department of California, Red Bluff, Calif., outlining the program of the American Legion and asking support of the same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5386. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Huntington, W. Va., protesting against the adoption of the metric system; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

5387. Also, petition of West Virginia State League, relative to representation in Congress from Southern States; to the Committee on the Census.

5388. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Huntington, W. Va., favoring the passage of the Rogers-Capper bills, House bill 14961 and Senate bill 4613; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 1, 1921.

(Legislative day of Monday, January 31, 1921.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I have a letter from the presidents of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National League of Women Voters, the National Women's Trade-Union League, the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Congress of Mothers' and Parent-Teacher Associations, sending to me a brief analysis and argument prepared by them in favor of national aid to education and in favor of the Smith-Towner bill. As a part of my remarks I ask to print the letter and their memoranda.

Mr. SMOOT. This is not the morning hour?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No. I think, however, as I have the floor in my own right, I could read it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that every one of us has received the same matter.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But I am anxious to have it go in the Record, in order that the Senate may be reminded of the contents of the statement. I will read it if the Senator prefers, but I do not desire to occupy the time of the Senate in that way.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, as it is to be printed as a part of the Senator's remarks, I shall not object. If it was the morning hour, I certainly would object.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not using the morning hour, because I know at that time I could not present it in this way. I ask leave to print the letter to which I have referred and the memoranda accompanying it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

OCTOBER 5, 1921.

Senator HOKE SMITH,
Atlanta, Ga.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The women of the United States, who have the chief responsibility for the training of our future citizens, are keenly interested in legislation which will make for the development and increased efficiency of our public schools. For this reason the great national organizations of women, whose names are signed below, having branch organizations in all the States and congressional districts, have indorsed the Smith-Towner bill now pending in Congress and are anxious that it be passed.

A copy of the bill and a brief analysis of its chief features are inclosed in order that you may give the measure your careful consideration. We are relying on you to assure us that if elected you will support this measure. Please send your reply

in the inclosed stamped envelope, which will be forwarded to the headquarters of our several organizations.

Thanking you in advance for the courtesy of a reply at your earliest convenience, we are,

Very truly, yours,

MRS. THOMAS G. WINTER,
President, for the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

MRS. MAUD WOOD PARK,
President, for the National League of Women Voters.

MRS. RAYMOND ROBINS,
President, for the National Women's Trade-Union League.

MRS. GEORGE MAYNARD MINOR,
President General, for the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution.

MRS. MILTON P. HIGGINS,
President, for Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations.

[Issued by National League of Women Voters and General Federation of Women's Clubs.]

SMITH-TOWNER BILL, H. R. 7 AND S. 1017, SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

"Do you know that one out of four of our soldiers in the late war could not read a newspaper intelligently or write a letter home?"

"That one out of three examined in the first draft was physically unfit for service?"

"That more than 5,000,000 boys and girls in America have no free school advantages or are taught by untrained teachers?"

"This is why we want the Smith-Towner bill."

"The women of the country are particularly interested in the passage of the Smith-Towner bill. They feel that the promotion of education and the proper training of the childhood of America is a matter of the highest importance."

"It must be conceded that whatever tends to elevate and strengthen the citizenship of any State promotes the welfare of the entire country, and that any disorder or weakness in a State or community subtracts from the general health and security of the Nation."

"This bill creates a department of education and provides Federal aid for encouraging the States in the promotion of education. It makes for efficiency in administration by consolidating the various educational agencies of the Government into one department under a responsible head, equal in rank to the heads of other executive departments. Every other great nation in the world has a department devoted to education."

"The bill provides that the National Government shall conduct research in the field of education. The people of any State should know what is being done educationally in all the States. A comparative study of educational conditions in the several States would undoubtedly have a most stimulating effect."

"We have a Department of Agriculture to promote the agricultural interests of the country. Why not a department of education to promote our educational interests? Are crops and live stock of more importance to the Nation than the training of her future citizens? We ask that no less attention be given to agriculture but that more be given to education."

"The bill also provides Federal aid to the States for the removal of illiteracy; for the Americanization of foreigners; for physical education, health, and sanitation; for the better training of teachers, and for the partial payment of teachers' salaries, and better educational opportunities for all the children of the Nation, particularly in rural districts."

"The precedent for Federal aid has become thoroughly established. The National Government appropriates money for the support of good roads, of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, and also for vocational education, household arts, and other forms of special education. Aid should undoubtedly be extended for the other purposes provided in this bill."

"The bill is carefully drawn to prevent centralization and to preserve to the States and local communities the management of the public schools. It provides—

"First. That its provisions shall not become operative until accepted by a State, and until at least an equal amount of money has been provided by the State or local authorities. (P. 10, lines 9-11, and p. 11, lines 16-20.)

"Second. That the money appropriated to a State shall be distributed and administered by the State in accordance with State laws. (P. 12, lines 8-11.)

"Third. That education in all its phases 'shall be organized, supervised, and administered exclusively by the legally constituted State and local education authorities of the State.' (P. 13, lines 1-10.)

"Thousands of children in America have no free school advantages and other thousands attend school in insanitary build-

ings, taught by uneducated teachers. Has our National Government no responsibility for the promotion of better conditions?

"The Smith-Towner bill rests on the assumption that in order to insure national prosperity and preserve our American institutions there must be developed through education a citizenship physically, intellectually, and morally sound, and that because of this fact the National Government is vitally interested in the promotion of public education in all the States."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I also have two resolutions passed by the Sons of Veterans Auxiliary, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, and the Women's Relief Corps, upon the same subject, which I ask leave to print.

Mr. SMOOT. As a part of the Senator's remarks?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. As a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SONS OF VETERANS AUXILIARY, U. S. A.,
Paterson, N. J., January 21, 1920.

Mr. J. KIRKWOOD CRAIG,
National Counselor.

DEAR BROTHER CRAIG: Resolution passed at the national encampment at Indianapolis was as follows:

"We, as the national organization of the sons of Veterans Auxiliary, want to go on record as favoring the passage of the Smith-Towner bill."

MARY L. TREDO,
National President.
STELLA E. BROOKS,
National Secretary.

EDUCATION AND AMERICANIZATION.

Inasmuch as the Grand Army of the Republic and allied orders are organized for the purpose of perpetuating the memory of the services and sacrifices of the veterans of 1861 to 1865, and for the purpose of inculcating love of country, patriotism, and Americanism; and

Whereas any Republic is safe and enduring only as its citizens are physically and intellectually sound and imbued with the true national spirit, knowing its history and loving its ideals; and

Whereas our national system of education has not reached its maximum efficiency and a real emergency exists as seen in the following facts:

1. Illiterates are numbered by the millions;
2. Many immigrants, now under the control of radicals, would make and become good American citizens if properly instructed in the Nation's history, advantages, and ideals;
3. More than half the pupils of grammar school are to be found in small village and rural schools under the instruction of immature, inexperienced teachers, many of whom have had only one or two years training beyond the eighth grade. This is due to economic conditions. Many teachers unable to exist on the salary received from teaching have accepted other positions; and

Whereas unrest, crime, anarchy, and bolshevism thrive on ignorance and misconceptions, governmental and otherwise: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Sons of Veterans, United States of America, in national encampment assembled, representing over 50,000 members, hereby go on record as favoring the passage of the Smith-Towner bill now before Congress, which has among its worthy objects the following:

I. The establishment of a department of education with a secretary on the President's Cabinet.

II. An appropriation to be expended among the several States, according to their needs, for the following purposes:

1. Removal of illiteracy.
2. Americanization of foreign born.
3. Equalizing of educational opportunities.
4. Physical education and sanitation.
5. Preparation of public-school teachers.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent the secretary of the National Educational Association, through the national chaplain, signed by the commander in chief and national secretary.

Passed at Indianapolis, Ind., this 24th day of September, 1920.
[SEAL.]

H. D. SISSON,
Commander in Chief.
H. H. HAMMER,
National Secretary.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
LADIES OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC,
OFFICE OF NATIONAL PRESIDENT,
Indianapolis, Ind., September 22, 1920.

Dr. J. KIRKWOOD CRAIG,
New York City.

DEAR COWORKER: The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the national convention, Wednesday, September 22, 1920:

"*Be it resolved*, That the National Order of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic in national convention assembled, hereby indorse the Smith-Towner bill. That this order of patriotic women, deeply interested in the matters involved in that bill, heartily recommend said bill to all of our Senators and Representatives: *Be it further resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the incoming national president to take the measures she deems advisable to interest the members of our order in said bill those members not in attendance at this national convention."

Respectfully submitted.

LILLIAN CLARK CARY,
National President.
GRACE A. SEEBERS,
National Secretary.

Resolution No. 54.

Inasmuch as the Grand Army of the Republic and allied orders are organized for the purpose of perpetuating the memory of the services and sacrifices of the veterans of 1861 to 1865, and for the purpose of inculcating love of country, patriotism, and Americanism:

Whereas our national system of education has not reached the maximum of efficiency and a real emergency exists, as seen in the following facts:

1. Illiterates are numbered by the millions.
2. Many immigrants, now under the control of radicals, would become good American citizens if properly instructed in the Nation's history and ideals.
3. More than half of the pupils of grammar schools are in small village and rural schools under the instruction of immature, inexperienced teachers, many of whom have had only one or two years' training beyond the eighth grade. Thus, due largely to economic conditions, many teachers, unable to exist on the salary received from teaching, have accepted other more remunerative positions; and

Whereas unrest, crime, anarchy, and bolshevism thrive on ignorance and misconceptions, governmental and otherwise: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Woman's Relief Corps, in national encampment assembled, hereby go on record as favoring the passage of the Smith-Towner bill, which has among its worthy objects the following:

I. The establishment of a department of education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet.

II. An appropriation, to be expended among the several States according to their needs, for the following purposes:

1. Removal of illiteracy.
2. Americanization of foreign born.
3. Equalizing of educational opportunities.
4. Physical education and sanitation.
5. Preparation of public-school teachers.

Be it further resolved, That we send a copy of these resolutions, signed by the national president and national secretary, to the National Educational Association, Washington, D. C.

Approved by committee.

The above was unanimously adopted by the convention.

ABBIE LYNCH,
Past National President.
ELIZA BROWN DAGGETT,
Past National Secretary.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I also have a short article from the Scottish Rite Masons Magazine and a short analysis of the bill from the New York Evening Post, which I ask to have printed as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

"NOTES AND COMMENTS."
"EDUCATION FIRST."

"The Smith-Towner bill, before Congress, has received the hearty indorsement of the great majority of the American people and is opposed by not more than one or two kinds of people. It is now before Congress, and does not need to be reintroduced, which it will have to be if it is not passed at this session of Congress. A determined effort, the source of which

is palpable, is now being made to defeat this bill, and more than one way is being used for that purpose. It is now proposed to create a department of public welfare, and include all matters of education under that department. This is putting the cart before the horse, for education is the prime factor in any welfare movement. Establish a department of education and let all welfare work come under that department. The object of the enemies of the Smith-Towner bill and of the establishment of a department of education is to submerge the whole scheme of education so that it may be conveniently lost in the shuffle. It is most important that our legislators be not deceived and led astray by casuistic argument. Education is the prime need in this country to-day, and the Smith-Towner bill and the creation of a department of education are the most important items before Congress and the country at this time. The object of the opposition is by any and all means to bring about delay in this matter, to put the business off until a more convenient season. No time is so convenient as now. Now is the time to attend to so vital a matter. Delay will be the first step toward the defeat of this most necessary legislation. Do it now!

[From the New York Evening Post, Jan. 15, 1921.]

FEDERAL SCHOOL BILL NOW BEFORE CONGRESS—FAVORABLE REPORT BY HOUSE COMMITTEE GIVES BILL UNUSUAL STATUS—AMENDED TO AVOID CHARGE OF CENTRALIZATION.

(By W. Carson Ryan, Jr., educational editor.)

"The plan for a Federal secretary of education and national aid for education is now squarely before Congress and the Nation. With the Smith-Towner bill reported favorably in the House this week, the outlook for prompt and vigorous Federal action in education is more promising than ever before in American history.

"NO CENTRALIZATION.

"In reporting the bill the House committee showed a determination to remove the last possibility of any centralized educational administration at Washington. The bill as reported says explicitly: 'Courses of study, plans, and methods of carrying out the purposes and provisions of this act shall be determined by the State and local educational authorities of each State, and this act shall not be construed to require uniformity of courses of study, plans, and methods in the several States.'

"It is further provided that 'all the educational facilities encouraged by the provisions of this act and accepted by a State shall be organized, supervised, and administered exclusively by the legally constituted State and local educational authorities of said State.'

"TIES IN WITH REORGANIZATION.

"Another amendment adopted by the committee makes the plan for a department of education tie in closely with proposed reorganization of the Government departments. Whereas the old bill provided only for the transfer to the new department of the existing Bureau of Education in the Interior Department, the amended measure includes in the Department of Education whatever bureaus Congress, through the new congressional commission, may assign to it.

"WHAT THE BILL PROPOSES.

"In its main outlines the bill remains unchanged. It creates a department of education, with a secretary of education in the President's Cabinet, and appropriates \$100,000,000 a year to be distributed to the States on the familiar half-and-half basis, the States being required to provide dollar for dollar as much as the National Government gives. Of this amount \$7,500,000 is to go for the instruction of illiterates, a similar sum for the education of immigrants, \$50,000,000 for equalization of educational opportunity as between city and country, \$20,000,000 for physical and health education, and \$15,000,000 for teacher training.

"The States, besides matching the appropriations dollar for dollar, are required to maintain compulsory education of at least 24 weeks' duration every year, private and parochial schools satisfying this requirement, provided only that the language of instruction is English.

"The department is allowed for its own expenses the modest appropriation of \$500,000, and must undertake researches in illiteracy, immigrant education, rural education, physical education, teacher training, higher education, and other fields.

"A NONPARTISAN MEASURE.

"The bill has been throughout a nonpartisan measure. Its sponsor in the House is Judge HORACE M. TOWNER, of Iowa, a veteran among the Republicans. In the Senate it has been championed by HOKE SMITH, of Georgia. Originally drafted by the emergency commission set up by the National Education Association during the war, the bill has undergone a number of modifications since its introduction. Forces actively behind the

bill—aside from the educational forces, which are all but unanimously for it—include the powerful group of women's organizations now united in legislative effort at Washington, hundreds of chambers of commerce, Rotary Clubs, and Kiwanis Clubs, and the American Federation of Labor, to say nothing of a host of influential organizations like the Daughters of the American Revolution, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and other bodies of representative character.

"OPPOSITION TO THE BILL.

"So far opposition to the bill has been entirely of a scattering nature. At the time of the hearings before Congress the members of the joint committee of the two Houses sought to bring out any opposition that there might be, holding at least one special hearing for this purpose, but no one appeared in opposition. A number of Catholic journals have carried on a discussion hostile to the bill, and one or two pamphlets have appeared designed to present that part of the opinion of the Catholic group that professes to see in the measure danger of centralization. The most notable document of this type is the very able one by William D. Guthrie, of the New York bar.

"BILL SHOULD BE ANALYZED.

"Whatever merit such an objection as that of Mr. Guthrie may have, it is important that it and every objection like it should be brought out into the light and discussed openly. Now is the time to make any changes if they are to be made. There are indications that the American people has about made up its mind on the essentials of this question. We are to have, beyond question, national action shortly in education. That it will take the form of a Federal department of education is almost certain, and that Federal aid in substantial amounts is to be forthcoming seems only a justifiable inference from the awakened understanding of education as a national concern."

RELIEF OF DISTRESS ABROAD.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Senate:

Supplementing my message of January 13, 1921, I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State accompanied by additional papers pertinent to the Senate resolution of January 3, 1921, requesting the Secretary of State to obtain and report to the Senate certain information with respect to the distressful conditions of women and children in foreign lands.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
1 February, 1921.

JANUARY 31, 1921.

The PRESIDENT:

In further response to the Senate's resolution of January 3, 1921, requesting the Secretary of State "to obtain through consular officers or other official representatives of the United States in foreign lands accurate information as to the actual conditions and the needs and necessities of the women and children of various distressed nations, countries, or foreign dependencies, and transmit the same to the Senate at the earliest possible moment," and further "to ascertain, if possible, and report to the Senate what the various Governments in which such suffering exists are doing looking toward the alleviation of such distressful conditions," the undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to their transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, papers pertinent to the resolution additional to those accompanying the report of the Acting Secretary of State dated January 11, 1921, and transmitted to the Senate by the President on January 13. These consist of a memorandum prepared at the request of the Acting Secretary of State by an official of the Department of State who investigated conditions in central Europe last summer, and telegrams from the American minister at Belgrade, the American commissioner at Budapest, and the American representatives at Bucharest, dated, respectively, January 13, 18, and 22, 1921.

Respectfully submitted.

BAINBRIDGE COLBY.

(Inclosures: As stated above.)

"JANUARY 15, 1921.

"The ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE:

"You asked me to draw up a memorandum as to what I saw last summer in central Europe of the need of relief and of the work of American organizations administering relief. This statement is drawn from my official reports on the various coun-

tries to the Secretary of State and from notes which I took at the time as to what I saw. My comments on what has happened since are taken either from official reports to the department or from personal letters received from members of the missions or other Americans in the countries concerned.

"AUSTRIA.

"I was in Vienna in the early part of July and again toward the middle of August. There was widespread unemployment, practically no factories were working, and food in adequate quantities was unobtainable except from dealers who sold contrary to the law and at prices which Austrians were unable to pay. I was told by various officers of the Government that food importations were being made sufficient to keep the population alive, but that the resources of the country were so limited that there seemed no possibility of buying, in addition to food, the coal and raw materials necessary to keep people at work and to enable Austria to get on its feet again economically.

"The American Red Cross had a few representatives in Vienna who were devoting themselves largely to medical work, although this organization was also distributing some food supplies to the hospitals. I had the impression that the work was being well done and that the distribution was efficient and economic.

"The important relief work being done in Vienna was, however, that of the American Relief Administration at its various child-feeding stations. Some 300,000 children were being fed at the time, but this number was to be reduced, temporarily at least, when the harvest became available. The men in charge of the American relief work were the best kind of Americans, devoted workers, often on the job from early morning until late at night. They took me to the warehouses where food delivered on food drafts was being distributed and to some of the stations where children were being fed. The children looked hungry and puny, and it was almost invariably the case that children who looked, for example, 5 years old, were actually 8 years old. In most cases the American Relief Administration food was practically all the children had, their parents being unable to feed them because of the excessive expense of food and the fact that such large numbers were out of work, receiving only the inadequate Government unemployment allowance. The Austrian Government, I was told, covered all the expense incident to this feeding except the actual cost of the food. The Government transported the food from the European port where it was landed, furnished the warehouses in which it was stored, and much of the personnel used in packing and distribution. This is true, in fact, of all the American Relief Administration child-feeding work in Europe. It is assisted in every way by the Governments concerned.

"HUNGARY.

"In Hungary, where I spent two weeks at the end of July, the situation as to food was not as serious as in Austria. This was partly due to the international labor blockade, which prevented the exportation of any food from Hungary. The Hungarian Government would not have permitted extensive exportation, because it was determined to conserve at least a minimum for the population of the country, but it probably would have let some food go out, because the economic situation was very serious, unemployment increasing, and the need of coal and raw materials imperative. There was some child feeding being done for the children of the very poorest classes, these often being the intellectual classes. Professors in the university, for example, who formerly received 15,000 crowns a year, now receive 25,000 crowns, whereas food prices had increased from 500 to 2,000 per cent. The situation was, furthermore, complicated by the enormous numbers of refugees, in most cases Jews from Galicia, who fled to Budapest during the war and were unwilling to return to their homes. These people were in many instances absolutely without resources. In Budapest, as in Vienna, the work of the American Relief Administration appeared to me excellent owing to an admirable personnel and the minimum of expense. The Hungarian Government had gone even further than the Austrian Government and had donated to the relief administration large sums of money monthly to enable it to make its work more effective and far-reaching. The children fed were of all classes, a very large proportion being Jews. I mention this fact only because allegations have been made that the Hungarian Government interfered with the relief to Jewish children. This was emphatically denied by American relief workers.

"SERBIA.

"The only place in Yugoslavia where I stayed any length of time was Belgrade. Here there was plenty of food; indeed, more food than was needed, as Serbia is essentially an agricultural country, and great difficulties were experienced in export-

ing the surplus. There was in Belgrade a plethora of foreign relief organizations which, it seemed to me, were competing with each other and were in many cases extravagant. The American Relief Administration was at that time withdrawing and has since, I am told, got out of the country altogether on the ground that its purpose is to feed hungry children, and that in Yugoslavia there is plenty of food. I had a long talk with the prince regent, who is in close touch with all that is going on in the country, and he said quite frankly that what the country needed as assistance from America was the services of experts who would teach sanitation and medicine and who would assist in reorganization of the transport system, so that all parts of the country could be efficiently served. The American Relief Administration is now buying a certain amount of food from Yugoslavia for use in its work in Austria. This being the case, it was obviously unnecessary to continue its feeding stations in Yugoslavia, since the principle of the work is that assistance will not be given where the fault lies not in lack of food but in lack of decent administration of the food resources. Only in Montenegro, which is now part of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, is the American Relief Administration doing any work. This mountainous bit of country can not be reached by railroads from the interior but must get its food from the Adriatic ports.

"CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

"In Czechoslovakia there was in many places real hunger, and even in villages in an agricultural country the American Relief Administration was doing some child feeding. I asked various people why this was necessary, and was told that the reason for lack of food was the unwillingness of the farmers to plant grain or to sell milk when the Government prices were too low to make it profitable; that as a result large areas normally planted in grain were not used and that the cattle were being used as draft animals. In connection with this I suggested that it seemed contrary to the policy of the American Relief Administration to give assistance in food supplies when the fault apparently lay in the local administration. The answer was that no American money given as charity was being used in this child feeding. The American Relief Administration sells food drafts to people who wish to send food to specific individuals. There is a certain profit on these drafts, and the American Relief Administration had agreed to use the profit in the country to which the drafts were sent. The flow of food drafts to Czechoslovakia had been and I believe still is large, and it is the surplus so acquired on these drafts which is being used for the not very extensive child feeding in the country.

"GERMANY.

"The situation as I saw it in Germany was in a very mild way similar to that in Austria. There was not sufficient food in the country to go around, and this lack affected first of all the children. Various members of the Government told me that they believed the stringency would be very severe during the coming winter, as the crops had not all been as successful as was expected, owing to the continuous rains. The food supplies from America, in accordance with the demonstrated need, are distributed to the children at the various stations in the different cities under the most careful supervision by the Friends Society. I was particularly interested in these stations to see how strictly the regulations were enforced. The children had to be fed actually at the station. Children were not allowed to take any food home, nor was, for example, an older child permitted to come to the station to take food home to a younger brother or sister said to be unable to come himself. The organization appeared to be taking every possible precautionary measure to prevent food from reaching those for whom it was not intended. I had very strongly the feeling in Berlin that from a purely humanitarian point of view this assistance might be needed through the winter, but that this will not be a long-continued appeal as the German economic conditions improve and the people are put to work.

"POLAND.

"The need of relief in Warsaw in September appeared to me quite as imperative as in Vienna. Poland is an agricultural country and should eventually be self-supporting so far as food supplies are concerned. At the moment, however, gradually recovering from repeated invasion, a large number of its agricultural workers killed or driven from the country, its situation is desperate. The bolshevist invasion in July and August, which came to the gates of Warsaw, meant the destruction or the carrying off of a very large proportion of the crops in the territory east and north of the city. Thus at the very time the crops were reaching maturity Poland saw them lost. There appeared to be every wish to get to work, to maintain a state of peace, and to devote all the national energies to retrieving the

disastrous economic condition of the country. The Polish mark was even in September very low. It has since fallen disastrously, and as a result very few people are able to purchase the food necessary to supply a family.

"The work of the American Relief Administration in Poland was being carried on very effectively and economically. It is true to say that in Poland the American Relief Administration alone is saving the lives of the oncoming generation. Any diminution of this work at the time would mean disaster.

"BALTIC PROVINCES.

"I was unable to go to Riga and Reval, but in Danzig had a long conversation with Dr. Ryan, the efficient chief of the American Red Cross work in the Baltic Provinces. The American Relief Administration at that time was, I understand, not operating in the Baltic Provinces, and is only now planning to extend its operations to that part of the world. The picture of starvation and disease among the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Esthonia that Dr. Ryan gave was appalling, and I believe that this extension of the child feeding is at the moment almost as important, from the life-saving point of view, as is the continuance of the work in unimpaired efficiency in Austria and Poland.

"GENERAL.

"My impression in all these countries was that the work of the relief administration was carried out in a fine American spirit by men well representative of this country in a manner as efficient and economic as it possibly could be. The attitude of all the people toward the work was one of the greatest gratitude and appreciation. It more than anything else held high the good name of the United States. The only objection that I found to the various charitable organizations working was that they somewhat overlapped and were therefore not always economic. This has been remedied by the fact that all the important organizations have joined with the American Relief Administration and that the feeding will be done by one organization."

[Copy. Telegram from American minister, Belgrade, Jan. 13, 1921.]
SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, D. C.:

Your circular of January 7, with instructions to reply by telegraph. General conditions have greatly improved in Serbia since the armistice, rendering unnecessary the need for general relief. There is, however, still a need of specific relief along the lines of caring for orphans and the repair and equipment of schools and hospitals and dispensaries.

The number of orphans in Serbia and Montenegro, according to official figures, is 200,000; 95,000 of whom live with relatives, 40,000 residing with families with Government aid, 10,000 in institutions supported by private funds or foreign missions, a number of which are being closed due to lack of funds; 5,000 are pensioned in families by the American Child Welfare Associations; and approximately 50,000 are not provided for but are living in extreme poverty and neglect with poor peasants who have taken them in.

A large number of schools need repairs and equipment. According to a preliminary official survey there are 130 ordinary schools totally unequipped and 75 trade schools and various agricultural schools to a large extent or wholly unequipped.

Much has been done by the Government and relief societies to replace hospital and dispensary equipment destroyed during the war, but there is still great need of equipment. Am unable to give figures.

My duties in Belgrade have prevented a personal inspection of the administration of American funds for relief work, most of which has been expended in southern and central Serbia and Montenegro, where there are also no consular representatives. From my limited observation and through information received from disinterested Americans and Serbians, it is my belief that these funds are being expended in an efficient and economical manner.

Apparently the Government is doing all in its power at the present time to meet above needs. Its ability to do this should increase considerably in the near future. Eventually it could probably without foreign aid take care of material needs, but the delay in this case would doubtless cause great injury to thousands of children and others.

(Signed) DODGE.

[Copy. Telegram from American commissioner, Budapest, Jan. 18, 1921.]

SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington, D. C.:

Department's circular telegram January 7. So far as Hungary is concerned, it is my opinion that the temporary need for child feeding is urgent only in the largest towns, not only because it

will save the lives and preserve the health of the coming generation, but also because it exercises an important stabilizing influence upon the social unrest.

(Signed) GRANT-SMITH.

[Telegram from American representative, Bucharest, Jan. 22, 1921.]
SECRETARY OF STATE,

Washington:

Your circular telegram of January 7 regarding relief situation: I learn from impartial and reliable sources that there is no starvation among children and women in Rumania. The American Relief Administration discontinued its child-feeding work in September, 1919, as such relief was found to be no longer necessary. Representatives of the Junior Red Cross have spent approximately \$14,000 within past six months for various items, mostly in connection with treatment of tuberculosis cases among children. Present governmental situation, together with financial and transportation difficulties, seriously hinder any relief work.

1. Upon investigation I have concluded that any relief funds supplied from the United States should be administered through the local organizations known as the Prince Mircea Society and the Child Welfare Society, under the direction of the Queen. The Child Welfare Society feeds and provides for 76,000 orphans.

2. The two societies named are the only organizations which can satisfactorily reach the needy and administer relief efficiently.

3. That the local representatives of American organizations here can not effectively reach the most deserving.

In conclusion, it seems apparent that the 76,000 war orphans now being cared for by the Child Welfare Society are the only really needy cases, and that they may best be assisted through turning available funds over to the Queen, who would be able to account for such work as was accomplished by the use of the funds so applied.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by Ashley Grange, No. 1211, of Ashley, Mich., favoring legislation making all United States war bonds and certificates legal tender within the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the Michigan Beekeepers' Association, of Lansing, Mich., favoring a tariff duty on honey, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution of the Law Enforcement Conference, adopted at Lansing, Mich., favoring legislation appropriating \$7,500,000 for the enforcement of the prohibition law and also in favor of an appropriation to enable attorneys of the Department of Justice to enforce prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution of the Federal Farm Loan Association, of Otero County, N. Mex., favoring the strengthening of the Federal farm loan act, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Farmers' Equity Union, at St. Louis, Mo., favoring adequate appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fullest study of domestic and foreign conditions of both production and consumption, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Burlingame Farmers' Club, of Burlingame, Kans., favoring legislation to prohibit gambling in farm products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Kansas State Horticultural Society, of Topeka, Kans., favoring legislation adopting a national standardized system of weights and measures, which was referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights and Measures.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the development of a naval aviation base at Sand Point, near Seattle, Wash., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 3.

To the honorable Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to consider and favorably act upon the following representations:

The north Pacific coast of the United States, including Alaska and the navy yard, Puget Sound, is without any adequate naval defense whatsoever. Adjoining the State of Washington on the north, at Esquimalt, on Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Dominion of Canada, the British Government has powerful naval defenses. The Territory of Alaska and the entire Puget Sound country, embracing the north Pacific coast, are without any naval defense whatsoever. The navy yard, Puget Sound, has already become one of the great naval stations of the

United States. To leave it without adequate defense would be a national disaster.

Realizing this condition of affairs, King County, the wealthiest and most populous county in the State, has, at an expenditure of over \$300,000, purchased for the Federal Government, free of charge to the Federal Government, a tract of land of about 400 acres at a point on Lake Washington, which naval experts, aviation experts, Army experts, and other men of highly intelligent and experienced judgment have declared to be the ideal site for an aviation field on the north Pacific coast. These experts and gentlemen have reached this conclusion after careful examination of all prospective and favorable situations on the north Pacific coast. A committee of the Congress of the United States has visited the Puget Sound country and examined the situation thus represented, and which is called Sand Point. One and all, they have declared it to be the one ideal site for an aviation field.

Before the close of the late World War the Navy Department of the United States had already determined that it was necessary to have a great aviation field at that point; but the close of the war left the question undecided.

In view of these circumstances, and of the heavy outlay made by said county of King in procuring for the Federal Government, without expense to it, a great site for an aviation field, the Legislature of the State of Washington respectfully asks the Congress to make the necessary appropriation for the establishment of a great aviation field at Sand Point, on Lake Washington, State of Washington.

Adopted by the senate, January 13, 1921.

W. J. COTLE,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house, January 17, 1921.

E. H. GEIS,
Speaker of the House.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8535) to provide for the redistribution of general taxes and special assessments due and payable on real estate in the District of Columbia, in cases of subdivision or sales of land therein, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 739) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12045) to provide for the conveyance of lots on the low grounds of Washington, District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 740) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4959) for the relief of Pettus H. Hemphill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORE (by request):

A bill (S. 4960) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 4961) to provide for advancement in grade of certain officers retired for disability incurred in active service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 250) to grant American citizenship to John George Waller; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 251) to authorize payment to members of the Army and Navy who were employed as enumerators during the Fourteenth Decennial Census to take the census of persons in the Army and Navy; to the Committee on the Census.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. RANDELL submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for clerk hire in the offices of the Shipping Commissioners, etc., from \$70,000 to \$83,200, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$45,000 to establish and maintain a forest experiment station at Asheville, N. C., for the purpose of conducting in the Appalachian hardwood adjacent forest regions silvicultural and other forestry experiments and investigations, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for the importation of karakul sheep under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for collecting, publishing, and distributing information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of live stock, agricultural products, etc., from \$390,160 to

\$430,160, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF WAR RISK INSURANCE ACT.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 13558) for the purpose of improving the facilities and service of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and of further amending and modifying the war-risk insurance act, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to ask whether amendments introduced prior to the presentation of the cloture application must be read to the Senate in order to be considered. Some weeks ago I introduced a couple of amendments to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the cloture rule shall be invoked by the Senate, "except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time."

Mr. THOMAS. Then I shall read the amendments to which I have referred.

Mr. BORAH. I could not understand the ruling of the Chair, and I am interested in the question of amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule is very plain. After the Senate votes to bring the debate to a close, the rule then provides that—

No Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the pending measure, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks.

That is the first time the Presiding Officer has had any duty conferred upon him.

Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

So it is quite clear that if the effort to invoke the cloture rule shall be successful, no amendment, except by unanimous consent, shall be in order unless the same has been presented and read prior to the adoption of the rule.

Mr. BORAH. I offer two amendments which I ask to have read.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMOOT. That is also what I rose to do.

Mr. ROBINSON. Under the rule, as I understand it, no privilege attaches to the stating or reading of an amendment. A Senator must procure the floor in his own right in order to have an amendment stated or read. The rule does not give him that privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not ruled on that question. The Chair stated the rule, that an amendment must be presented and read before the cloture rule goes into effect.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Arkansas understands that the Chair has not ruled on that question, but I am making a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not believe that a Senator can take the floor as a matter of right.

Mr. ROBINSON. Or that any privilege attaches to the statement of an amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. None whatever.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. In my opinion the Chair has stated the rule exactly as it was intended, but I wish to ask this question: Is it necessary actually to read the amendment or shall it be taken, the same as every other amendment that has been offered, as having been read, there being no objection?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that it must be read. There is no use of putting that in the rule unless it be adhered to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator from Arkansas stated, I merely wish to say that as the cloture rule is now before the Senate to be voted on tomorrow, if one objection could prevent a Senator from offering an amendment, the right and the opportunity to present the amendment would be taken from him. It seems to me that the right to offer an amendment under the rule must be preserved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not so rule.

Mr. LODGE. I did not suggest that the Chair did so rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, no. The Chair did not so rule.

Mr. LODGE. I did not suggest that he did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not so rule. The Chair rules that if the Chair recognizes a Senator on the bill he can put in his time presenting and reading his amendment, but he can not take another Senator off the floor for the purpose of presenting an amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, certainly not; but if a Senator holding the floor offers an amendment one objection can not stop him. He has a right to offer it because the bill is pending for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. McCUMBER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota, if I can do so without yielding the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to offer a mere suggestion, first, to those who desire to offer amendments. Those in charge of the bill do not wish to deprive any Senator of full opportunity to present his amendments. I think the proper method is for us to adjourn this evening until to-morrow at 12 o'clock, and then, under the head of morning business, every amendment can be presented and read during the first hour. That would give full opportunity. If any Senator feels that he will not have that opportunity in the morning, I suggest that any Senator would feel disposed to yield for the purpose of having an amendment read into the record.

I wish the opportunity at this time, not to exceed five minutes, to reply to a statement made by the Senator from Ohio yesterday concerning my argument upon the tariff bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator, if I do not lose the floor, and I will then yield to the Senator from Idaho for his amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is going a little too far. The Chair can not permit the floor to be farmed out.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not propose to farm out the floor, but I desire to accommodate my friend the Senator from North Dakota. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] certainly has a right to introduce his amendment if he wants to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, there is no objection to plowing a couple of furrows.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think there will be no trouble on this matter. Yesterday in discussing the pending emergency tariff bill the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] stated:

Now, we have the spectacle of a Republican majority trying to tax everything that goes on the table of the workingman.

My good friend the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] tells the Senate how perfectly simple this question of the tariff upon wheat is. He understands it thoroughly, but I think he is the only Senator who understands his own argument.

Mr. President, I take occasion to thank the Senator from Ohio for his compliment, and to regret my inability, through a lack of proper expression, to convince either the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator that 5 added to 7 makes 12. I thought the declaration was so self-evident that it did not need a great deal of elucidation. But the Senator from Ohio evidently thought I did not make the matter as clear as I should.

I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to his own argument upon the same bill and to put up to him the question whether or not he understands even his own argument upon the bill. The Senator from Ohio said:

Mr. President, when I pick up this bill I find a duty on wheat of 40 cents a bushel, on corn of 15 cents a bushel, etc.

I find a duty on butter of 8 cents a pound, on cheese of 8 cents a pound, on fresh milk of 2 cents a gallon, on cream of 5 cents a gallon, and so on.

I suppose the Senator means by that that a duty of 2 cents on a gallon, one-half of 1 cent per quart, of milk is a terrible imposition upon those who use milk for breakfast.

I wish the Senator could have heard for a moment the testimony taken before the Committee on Finance in which it was stated that the man who drives the milk wagon in New York City receives from \$185 to \$200 and more in some instances for seven hours of labor for delivering milk; and I wonder if the Senator has compared the earnings of the farmer who gets 6 or 8 cents for a quart of milk with the earnings of the man who drives the milk wagon for from \$185 to \$200 per month.

Now, I wish to quote from the Record. After the Senator from Ohio had discussed the matter, and declared again and again that he did not wish to impose a tax upon the breakfast

table, a little colloquy occurred between the Senator from Ohio and myself. I read from the Record, as follows:

Mr. McCUMBER. If, as is contended on the other side of the Chamber by a great many who are discussing the subject, the Canadian gets no better prices in the United States and no advantage by shipping his grain to the United States than he would get by shipping it to Liverpool, then why is this measure going to hurt Canada in the slightest degree? Of course, I think the Canadian will not agree with that. I think the Canadian will get a better price if he can ship it here.

Mr. POMERENE. I have heard my good friend from North Dakota discuss the question so often, and I know with such sincerity on his part, and at the same time, I think, with such gross error on his part, that I am afraid he and I can not get together at all.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not wish to get together on the argument; I simply wish to know why, if there is no advantage to the Canadian in sending his wheat into the United States, he would suffer by the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. I have no doubt he has some advantage, but so has the United States some advantage.

Further on the Senator from Ohio said:

It benefits the Canadian perhaps because he has a closer market.

Again referring to the same proposition, that the American farmer would get no benefit, I then asked the Senator from Ohio:

But if it does not increase the price of grain to the American farmer, then how is it adding a tax to the workingman's breakfast?

Mr. POMERENE. It adds to the price to the workingman because the tariff is always used by the retailer as an excuse to boost the price, as everyone knows who has looked into the subject.

I wish to suggest to the Senator from Ohio that I really think he underrates the weakness of his own argument. I know that he is not satisfied with that poor answer. Again I put the simple question directly to those who claim that we are pulling the wool over the farmers' eyes and ask them to answer it: If the bill will not add one cent to the price of the farmers' product, then how on earth is it going to add to the cost of the breakfast table?

Several Senators on the other side of the Chamber have again and again asserted that we are pulling the wool over the farmers' eyes. Mr. President, along in September and October and up until November last the farmers of my State were asking not for a mere tariff but they were appealing to the President of the United States to put an embargo upon Canadian grain. I advised them that there was no law, as I understood the law, that would allow the President to do so, unless the exercise of such power might come under the antidumping law, which would not apply where the imported product was sold in the Canadian market for home consumption for the same price for which it was sold for export, and that the only remedy, therefore, would be the application of a tariff. If the farmers are pulling the wool over their own eyes, or if we are pulling the wool over their eyes, and they do not understand the situation, then why not give them an opportunity to try it and let them determine who is being fooled in the matter. You say they will receive no benefit. If they receive no benefit, then the consumer can not possibly suffer an injury. Again I put the question to any Senator who can answer it: If the proposed law would not raise the price of wheat one penny to the American farmer, then how on earth could it raise the price of flour to the ultimate consumer?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Colorado yield for a moment, in order that I may propound an inquiry to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I promised the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that I would, if the Chair permitted, yield the floor long enough for him to offer an amendment, which he has several times attempted to submit. I now yield to him.

Mr. BORAH. I offer two amendments to the pending bill and ask that they be read. It will not take over two minutes to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 5 of the bill it is proposed to strike out lines 21, 22, and 23, which read as follows:

24. Milk, preserved or condensed, or sterilized by heating or other processes, including weight of immediate coverings, 2 cents per pound; sugar of milk, 5 cents per pound.

Also, on page 5, to strike out lines 19 and 20, as follows:

23. Milk, fresh, 2 cents per gallon; cream, 5 cents per gallon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendments will lie on the table.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. MOSES. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for the purpose of offering an amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all of the bill after line 4, on page 1, and to insert the following:

And paid upon articles, when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), the rates of duty prescribed by the act of Congress approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will lie on the table.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask the Secretary to read an amendment which I offered some days ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert as a new section at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. —. The revenues derived from the duties herein provided shall constitute a fund and the same is hereby appropriated for the relief of employees who through no fault of their own have become idle because of the emergency which this act is designed to overcome. The moneys here appropriated shall be distributed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under such rules and regulations as he, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall provide.

The relief herein provided for shall not be extended to any person after his or her reemployment, whether by former employer or in other vocations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will lie on the table.

Mr. THOMAS resumed the speech begun by him on Saturday last. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of sending an amendment to the desk to be read in conformity with the rule?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to make an inquiry of the Senate of the United States. Does it want to act under any rules, or does it want to do just as it pleases? There is an unqualified rule here to the effect that no Senator shall be interrupted for the purpose of introducing a bill or an amendment, and that the Chair himself shall enforce the rule.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not want to violate the rule, as far as I am concerned; but speakers in this Chamber ever since I have been here have yielded the floor from time to time for that identical purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Exactly; and the Chair does not care anything about it, except that the rule puts the responsibility upon the Chair. If the Chair enforces the rule, Senators become irritated. If the Chair does not enforce it, they see him in his chamber and inquire why he does not do it. The Chair does not care about it one way or the other, but that is what the rule provides.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a moment, I merely presented the amendment at this time because, under the cloture rule, it has to be sent to the desk and read prior to the vote to bring debate to a close.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think a rule of that kind should be observed when an application for cloture is pending. However, I shall conform myself to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment. The Chair only desired to call attention to the rule. The Chair does not care anything about it.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

On page 2, line 21, after the word "lemons," insert the following: "Limes, oranges, grapefruit, and shaddock."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table.

Mr. THOMAS resumed his speech. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. PHIPPS. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me, that I may submit an amendment and have it read?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). The amendment will be read:

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

On page 6, after line 24, insert the following:

"29. Tungsten-bearing ores and concentrates, \$9 per unit of tungstic trioxide therein contained, a unit being herein defined as 1 per cent of a short ton of 2,000 pounds, namely, 20 pounds of tungstic trioxide; metallic tungsten, tungsten powder, ferrotungsten, ferrotungsten powder, scrap steel containing tungsten fit only to be remanufactured, commercial tungstic acid, calcium tungstate, sodium tungstate, and all other salts of tungsten (except high-speed tungsten steel, tools, and other manufactured articles made of or containing tungsten, and all alloy steels containing tungsten), and all other compounds containing tungsten not specifically provided for in this section, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound of each of said substances or materials for each per cent or fraction thereof of tungsten contained therein; high-speed tungsten steel, tools, and other manufactured articles made of or containing tungsten, and all alloy steels containing tungsten, 35

per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not be deemed to repeal any tariff now existing upon any substances or materials mentioned therein."

On page 7, line 2, strike out the following: "and 20)," and insert in place thereof: "20 and 29)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is quite apparent that with these amendments coming in as they are to-day, when we get to a vote we shall have a very, very large tariff bill. In view of the fact that all the amendments have to be presented and read before we vote on the cloture question—and we have to vote to-morrow at 1 o'clock—I wish to ask unanimous consent that all the amendments, including amendments coming in to-day and those that have been offered heretofore, be printed together, so that we may know exactly what is the size of the bill and the amendments we shall have to vote on. Let them be printed together and placed on the desks of Senators.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator wish to include in that request the amendment proposing a codification of the Statutes of the United States?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I will agree to eliminate that.

Mr. McCUMBER. Amendments that have been offered with no objection are to be presumed to have been read?

Mr. THOMAS. The Vice President did not so rule this morning.

Mr. SIMMONS. I mean that they will actually have the right, in the eventuality of cloture, to be considered.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will exclude the proposed revised code from his request, I shall have no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think we will be able to dispose of that amendment more easily than we will some of the amendments which double and probably more than double the protective duties now imposed upon manufactured as well as upon agricultural products.

Mr. McCUMBER. The point I am making is one in good faith, the Senator must understand.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the amendments are adopted, those which have been offered, there will be no longer an emergency agricultural bill, but an emergency manufacturers' bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HARRISON. I ask that the unanimous-consent request may be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be stated by the Secretary.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the adoption of the following order: That all amendments presented and read to the Senate upon the pending emergency tariff bill be printed in one copy and placed upon Senators' desks.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask if the Senator from North Carolina will consent and will the Senate consent that amendments which are intended to be proposed to the emergency tariff bill, instead of being read under the rule touching the matter, be presented and not go through the formality of being read?

Mr. THOMAS. The Vice President, occupying the chair this morning, ruled, and I think correctly, that under our cloture rule all amendments to be voted upon, in the event the Senate decides for cloture, must have been read to the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I thought, perhaps, the Senate itself, by unanimous consent, could change that proposition so that they may be presented whether read or not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not understand that to be the rule. I understand that only those amendments offered between now and the time when cloture is ordered, if at all, must be read.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is mistaken, because I asked the question, having introduced two amendments some time ago, and the ruling was as I have stated.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator mean to say an amendment that has been pending for a week has to be read before it is competent to be offered?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; under the rule.

Mr. SIMMONS. I must express my astonishment at that ruling.

Mr. SMOOT. I asked particularly of the Presiding Officer, when the Vice President was in the chair, whether that was the construction of the rule, and he replied that it was.

Mr. THOMAS. I asked it because of my pending amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. The language of the rule may justify that construction, but, in my judgment, no such purpose was in the mind of the Senate when the rule was adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a different proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to propose a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent that all amendments which are proposed to the pending bill to be voted on after 1 o'clock upon the adoption of the cloture rule, should it be adopted, shall be presented before the time of voting on that rule, but that they need not be read.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not quite understand the request. Will the Senator repeat it?

Mr. HARRISON. I am asking unanimous consent to change the rule to this extent, that the amendments may not be read, but must be presented before the time of voting on the cloture rule to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. I object, because the ruling has already been made by the Vice President that that can not be done under the rule.

Mr. THOMAS resumed his speech. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. SMOOT. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment to offer an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. SMOOT. I offer an amendment to House bill 15275, which I ask may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the committee relating to sugar, sirups of cane juice, and so forth, embraced in lines 13, page 4, down to and including line 16, page 5, insert the following:

Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, seventy-one one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscope test, twenty-six one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing not above 40 degrees, 15 per cent ad valorem; testing above 40 degrees and not above 56 degrees, 2½ cents per gallon; testing above 56 degrees, 4½ cents per gallon; sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscope test. That the duties in this paragraph herein imposed are in addition to the rates of duty imposed on such sugar by existing laws, and shall in no manner affect or impair such existing laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will lie on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word. I suppose there are very few Senators who will know just what the amendment means without going into the figures. The present law imposes a duty of 1 cent per pound after the 20 per cent Cuban differential is deducted; and this simply means that it will be 2 cents instead of 1, or 1 cent additional.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Utah?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand the Senator to say that the additional tax which he proposes is only 1 cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Just 1 cent a pound.

Mr. SIMMONS. That would make the tax a little over 1 cent.

Mr. SMOOT. It would make it 2 cents and a fraction. I think it is three one-thousandths of a cent above 1 cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. That would raise the Cuban sugar, duty paid, to a little over 6 cents.

Mr. SMOOT. On to-day's market.

Mr. SIMMONS. At to-day's price?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it would only raise it to 5½ cents.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator, of course, must include, in addition to the Cuban farmer's price, the cost of hauling to the ports, which brings it up to about 4 cents, as I am advised.

Mr. SMOOT. The market price was 4½ cents the other day. I did not notice what it was this morning, but this would add a cent to it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me ask the Senator—I am asking him because he is very well posted about these matters—what is the differential now in favor of refined sugar?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is 1.53 cents.

Mr. SIMMONS. That would be 7.53, or 7½ cents. Now, if you add the jobber's profit, and the retailer's profit, I suppose

that would bring the sugar in this country up to from 10 to 11 cents a pound?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it should not do that. I notice from an advertisement in the paper that the retail price in the District of Columbia is 8 cents.

Mr. SIMMONS. I know it is, now.

Mr. SMOOT. So that if we only add 1 cent more, it should not add more than 1 cent to that price, which is 9 cents. It simply means an addition of 1 cent a pound.

Mr. THOMAS resumed his speech, which will be published hereafter. Upon the conclusion of his remarks Mr. THOMAS said:

I ask, Mr. President, in view of the ruling of the Chair, that the amendment I have offered may now be read, and I will then yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McLEAN in the chair). The Secretary will read the amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. I have several amendments to offer that are of some length and which it will take some time to read. There are several speeches to be made this afternoon. I understand two or three Senators want to discuss the bill, and I want to say something about it. I was wondering if we could present these amendments now and have them read a little later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado insist upon the reading of his amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not want to take chances. I am perfectly willing, of course, if it can be done, that an hour shall be set apart for the reading of the amendments; but, inasmuch as I announced when I began this morning that during my discussion I would present this amendment, as required by the rule, I would like to have it read.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I have a very short amendment, consisting of only two lines, and I would like to have it read.

Mr. HARRISON. Can we not agree that between 5 and 6 o'clock all amendments presented shall be read, the one offered by the Senator from Colorado to be given the preference?

Mr. McCUMBER. I was going to suggest, Mr. President, that on an amendment like this—a very long amendment—we might have unanimous consent that the reading of it by the title be full compliance with the rule with reference to the reading of amendments under the cloture rule.

Mr. POMERENE. Then I suggest that we have the amendments printed in the RECORD as if they had been read in full.

Mr. McCUMBER. The reason why I do not wish to include that is because an amendment like the one offered by the Senator from Colorado is already printed, and there are some amendments which have been offered that are so long that, of course, it would be impossible to get them printed in a week.

Mr. HARRISON. When I offered the recodification of laws proposition I did not ask to have it printed. I can make it the subject of a separate request before the hour set to-morrow.

Mr. RANDELL. Will the Senator from North Dakota repeat his request? I did not happen to be in the Chamber, and I have two or three amendments in which I am interested. So I would like to know what the request is.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] requested, as a part of his remarks, that the amendment which he had just presented, which I believe is the immigration bill, should be read. To avoid the necessity of consuming time in reading it, I suggested a unanimous-consent agreement that the bill which has just now been offered as an amendment should be read by its title only, and that that should be considered a sufficient compliance with the rule to entitle the same to be offered as an amendment to the tariff bill, if a cloture rule should be adopted.

Mr. RANDELL. The Senator's request applies simply to that one particular amendment, but not to all amendments?

Mr. McCUMBER. Not to all amendments, because it will take only a few moments to read those which are very short.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I offer a very short amendment, which I ask to have read and printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The READING CLERK. In the item relating to cotton, on page 3, line 11, strike out the numeral "7" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "30," so as to read "30 cents per pound."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous con-

sent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado be read by its title. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The reading clerk read the caption of the amendment, and it was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 4, after section 4, add the following:

"SEC. 5. The term 'United States' means the United States and any waters, territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof except the Isthmian Canal Zone and the Philippine Islands; but if any alien, or any alien seaman, leaves the Canal Zone or any insular possession of the United States and attempts to enter any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States nothing contained in this act shall be construed as permitting him to enter under any other conditions than those applicable to all aliens, or to all alien seamen, respectively;

"The term 'immigration act' means the act of February 5, 1917, entitled 'An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States'; and the term 'immigration laws' includes such act and all laws, conventions, and treaties of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens; and

"The word 'alien' includes any person not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, but this definition shall not be held to include Indians of the United States not taxed nor citizens of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States.

"SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this act, from 60 days after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of 14 months next after its passage, the immigration of aliens to the United States is prohibited, and during such time it shall not be lawful for any alien to enter the United States from any foreign port or place, or, having so entered, to remain within the United States.

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 2 shall not apply to otherwise admissible aliens lawfully resident in the United States, nor to otherwise admissible aliens of the following status or occupations, when complying with the requirements of this section and with all other provisions of the immigration laws:

"(1) Government officials, their families, attendants, servants, and employees.

"(2) Travelers or temporary sojourners for pleasure or business who may enter the United States during the time of suspension of immigration for a period not exceeding six months each, which period may be extended in individual cases by the Secretary of State.

"(3) Bona fide students who may enter the United States solely for the purpose of study at educational institutions particularly designated by them; and upon graduation, completion, or discontinuance of studies they shall not be entitled to remain in the United States.

"(4) Ministers of any religious denomination.

"(b) An alien belonging to one of the classes or persons enumerated in subdivision (a) shall be permitted to enter the United States only upon presentation of a valid passport or other official document in the nature of a passport (hereinafter referred to as a passport) satisfactorily establishing his identity, nationality, and to which of the classes so enumerated he belongs, together with a signed and certified photograph of the bearer attached. A wife, or a female child under 21 years of age, or a male child under 16 years of age, may be included in the passport of a husband or parent, but a photograph of each must be attached to the passport. Each male child 16 years of age or over must carry a separate passport.

"(c) Each such passport must be viséed by an American consulate, or a diplomatic mission if specially authorized, in the country from which the holder starts on his trip to the United States, and if such country is not the country to which he owes allegiance the passport must also be viséed by a diplomatic or consular officer therein of his own country. In all cases the passport must also be viséed by an American consulate, or the diplomatic mission if specially authorized, in the country from which the alien embarks for the United States, or if he comes by land, the country by which he enters the United States.

"(d) Each alien coming within the provisions of this section, except a duly accredited Government official, must furnish to the American diplomatic or consular officer who visés the passport in the foreign country from which he starts on his trip to the United States, and to the American authorities at the port of entry or elsewhere in the United States, a written declaration setting forth: (1) The date and place of the bearer's birth; (2) the nationality and race of his father and mother; (3) the place of the bearer's last foreign residence and the other places, if any, where he has resided within the past five years, and what has been his occupation during that period; (4) if he has ever been in this country, the dates and objects of his visits and the places and addresses where he resided or sojourned; (5) the date set for his departure for the United States, the port of embarkation, and the name of the ship on which he is to sail, if he goes by water; (6) names and addresses of persons acquainted with the applicant in the country from which he starts and in the United States, if any; (7) the expected duration and object of his proposed visit to this country, the documentary or other proofs of such objects submitted, and the place or places in the United States where he expects to sojourn or reside; (8) that the bearer knows and understands the provisions of the immigration laws, excluding certain classes of aliens from the United States, and is certain that he does not fall within any of such classes; (9) that the bearer understands that if, on arrival at a port of the United States, he is found to be a member of a class excluded by the immigration laws, he will be deported if practicable, or, if for any reason deportation should be found to be impracticable, will be held in detention in an immigration station or other place of confinement, and that he is, with full understanding thereof, assuming all risks involved in a possible return trip in consequence of being rejected under such law.

"(e) A wife or minor child who does not expect to reside with the husband or father in the United States must carry a separate declaration.

"(f) Each declaration must be affirmed or sworn to before a consular officer, or a diplomatic officer of the United States if specially authorized, and signed in triplicate, and a photograph of the declarant must be attached to each copy with an impression of the official seal. The declaration must be made at least two weeks before the date of intended departure, except in cases of extraordinary emergency. One copy of the declaration must be filed in the embassy, legation, or consulate by which the passport is first viséed, one copy forwarded immediately to the Commissioner of Immigration or inspector in charge at the port of entry by which the declarant expects to enter the United States, and one copy fastened to the passport of the declarant in such a way that it may be removed upon his departure from the United States. The copy last mentioned must be presented with the passport

to the official at the port of entry into this country who examines passports, and to the immigration official who inspects the holder, and to such other officials in the United States as may be authorized to inspect such documents.

"SEC. 8. (a) A citizen of the United States 21 years of age or over, who is a resident of the United States, may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, apply to him for permission to bring into the United States or send for an otherwise admissible wife, parent, grandparent, unmarried son or brother under 21 years of age, unmarried or widowed daughter, or sister, grandson under 16 years of age whose father is dead, or unmarried or widowed granddaughter whose father is dead; and any alien who has declared, in the manner provided by law, his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and who is a resident of the United States, may make like application in reference to an otherwise admissible husband or wife, unmarried son under 21 years of age, or unmarried or widowed daughter; but no application may be made under this paragraph in the case of any relative by adoption.

"(b) If the Secretary of Labor is satisfied that the entry into the United States of such relative would not be in violation of the immigration laws, and that such relative is likely to prove a desirable resident of the United States, he may issue a permit to the applicant, under such regulations as he may prescribe, which shall authorize the immigration officers at the port of entry to examine such relative upon arrival at such port. Thereafter the right of such relative to admission shall be as provided by the immigration laws, except that it shall not be subject to the act entitled 'An act to prevent in time of war departure from and entry into the United States, contrary to the public safety, approved May 22, 1918,' or to the provisions of any proclamation, order, rule, or regulation made thereunder, and except that the literacy test may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, be waived in the case of such relative.

"SEC. 9. Nothing in section 2 shall be held to prevent the importation of skilled labor under the conditions prescribed in the fourth proviso to section 3 of the immigration act, nor to the importation of persons employed as domestic servants.

"SEC. 10. The joint resolution approved October 19, 1918, entitled 'Joint resolution authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or who have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or cobelligerent forces' is hereby amended by adding thereto a proviso reading as follows: 'Provided, That if any such alien shall on arrival at a port of the United States be found to be afflicted with a loathsome or contagious disease, such alien shall not be readmitted until he shall have been treated in hospital and the disease reduced to a noncontagious stage.'

"SEC. 11. During the period of suspension provided for in section 2 otherwise admissible aliens who have resided continuously in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, or the Republic of Mexico for at least one year may be temporarily admitted, for a period not exceeding six months, from such countries, under such rules governing entry, inspection, temporary stay, and departure as may be prescribed by the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor.

"SEC. 12. Any alien who at any time after entering the United States is found to have been at the time of entry not entitled under this act to enter the United States, or to have remained therein for a longer time than permitted under section 3 or section 7, shall be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided for in sections 19 and 20 of the immigration act.

"SEC. 13. The provisions of sections 18 and 20 of the immigration act, assessing a penalty for failure or refusal to accept, to detain, or guard safely, to return, and to transport to foreign destination aliens excluded or expelled from the United States, or to pay maintenance and deportation expenses of aliens, or for making any charge for the return of excluded or expelled aliens, or for taking any security for the payment of such charge, or for taking any consideration from aliens to be returned in case of landing, or for bringing to the United States any deported aliens within a year from date of deportation without the consent of the Secretary of Labor, shall apply to and be enforced in connection with the provisions of this act relating to the exclusion or expulsion of aliens.

"SEC. 14. Willfully to give false evidence or swear to any false statement in connection with the enforcement of this act shall constitute perjury as such offense is defined in section 16 of the immigration act; and the provisions of sections 16 and 17 of the immigration act, prescribing methods of procuring evidence concerning aliens, and defining offenses and prescribing punishments therefor, shall apply to and be enforced in connection with the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 15. Any person who substitutes any name for the name written in any document herein required, or any photograph for the photograph attached to any such document, or forges or in any manner alters any such document, or falsely personates any person named in any such document, or issues or utters any forged or fraudulent document, or presents to an immigrant inspector or other Government official any forged or fraudulent document, and any person other than the one to whom there has been duly issued any document prescribed by this act who presents to an immigrant inspector or other Government official any such document, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall in cases where no other penalty is required by law be fined in a sum not exceeding \$1,000 or be imprisoned for a term of not more than five years, or both.

"SEC. 16. The Commissioner General of Immigration shall, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, issue such regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be deemed necessary and appropriate to place this act in full force and operation (except that regulations for the viséing of passports under section 3 shall be made by the Secretary of State). Such regulations shall include special rules for the application of this act to the cases of aliens coming to the United States from or through contiguous foreign territory, and to the cases of aliens entering across the land boundaries for temporary stay or at frequent intervals; also special rules to insure that the provisions of this act, of the immigration act, or of any law, convention, or treaty relating to immigration shall not be violated by aliens arriving at ports of the United States employed on vessels as seamen, and that, at the same time, the enforcement of such laws shall not interfere with the operation of the act approved March 4, 1915, entitled 'An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States, to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto, and to promote safety at sea.'

"SEC. 17. The provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws."

Mr. McCUMBER. I further ask unanimous consent that this reading shall be held to be a full compliance with the cloture rule requiring an amendment to be read when it is presented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, of course, this amendment of mine is pending without having been read in full.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANDELL. I merely wish to present a brief amendment, which I will ask to have read. I would like, if the Senator will yield a moment longer, to present to have read two other amendments, one offered by my colleague, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY], and the other by myself, so that they may be considered under the cloture rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendments.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, between lines 23 and 24, insert:

Campbor, crude natural, refined, and synthetic, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. RANDELL. I ask that the other two amendments may be read, so that they will comply with the rule. They are very short.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read.

The READING CLERK. Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. GAY:

On page 4, after line 3, insert the following:

"18. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75°, 2½ cents per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscope test seventy-eight one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing not above 40°, 45 per cent ad valorem; testing above 40° and not above 56°, 63 cents per gallon; testing above 56°, 13½ cents per gallon. Sugar draining and sugar sweeping shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscope test.

"That the duties in this paragraph herein imposed are in addition to the rates of duty imposed on such sugars by existing laws, and shall in no manner affect or impair such existing laws: *Provided*, That if the imposition of the duties herein shall have the effect of increasing the price in the ports of the United States of duty-paid 96° centrifugal sugar produced in and imported from Cuba beyond 8 cents per pound, or shall increase the price in the ports of the United States of similar sugars paying full duty beyond 8½ cents per pound, or shall increase the price in the ports of the United States of sugars that have gone through a process of refining, or sugars fit for direct human consumption, beyond 10 cents per pound, then the emergency duty herein named shall be automatically decreased so as to prevent the prices of such sugars advancing beyond the respective prices herein named."

In section 2, page 4, line 5, insert a comma after the figure 15, strike out "and" and insert after figure 17 "and 18."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. RANDELL:

On page 3, line 1, strike out "three-eighths" and insert "one-eighth," so as to read:

"Cotton having a staple of 1½ inches or more in length, 7 cents per pound."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. These amendments will lie on the table.

Mr. HARRISON and Mr. TOWNSEND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Did the Senator rise to make a speech?

Mr. HARRISON. I was going to endeavor to make a short speech. Does the Senator desire to make a speech?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to take a very few minutes of the time of the Senate. I never make a long speech. I wish to occupy only a few minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. I should like to accommodate the Senator. How long will the Senator take?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. If I can get recognition afterwards, I yield.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, it is going to be very difficult for me to express in proper language the feelings that I have in reference to the present parliamentary situation. I have, however, felt that we were not only doing a vain thing, and one that is admitted to be such to begin with, but that we are wasting very precious time of the Senate which ought to be devoted to something else.

It is said that many of the measures which are now before the Congress can go over until the next session, which, of course, is true, and which probably will be the result, but I had assumed that the country and the Senate were impressed with the fact that the next Congress had some special duties to perform, to which its almost undivided attention would be directed. The tariff bill, part of which is now before us, it is admitted will have to be considered at the special session, as will be the case with all other fiscal legislation. The question of our foreign relations is to come up at that time. These are important mat-

ters. The new Congress should not be diverted to matters of appropriations at that time.

The pending bill, however, is introduced as emergency legislation and with the absolute certainty that if we shall pass it, it will be vetoed. It is admitted here, however, that so long as the bill is before the Senate our Democratic friends are going to talk against it or for it, and if it shall be passed, they are still going to continue to talk about it until the end of the session. Our Republican friends say that if the cloture falls to-morrow, they are still going to hold the bill before the Senate, which means, if Senators are correct, that nothing else can be considered at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I have very little sympathy with the proposition to amend the tariff piecemeal. Almost from the beginning of legislation this session we have been ostensibly legislating for the farmer. The farmer has come to know that he is being fooled. He knows that much of the legislation enacted in his name or interest is in reality for the supposed political benefit of many of its advocates. For days we held before the Senate the nitrate bill, in the interest of the farmer. We all know now that it was not in the interest of the farmer, and he knows it, too.

We are now holding a bill here in the interest of the farmer, and we see the spectacle of Senator after Senator rising to ask that it be amended with a proposition to secure protection for his particular locality. If it is politics that is prompting this side of the Senate to bring up the measure and force it at this time under existing circumstances, then I must submit that it is mighty poor politics.

I desire to have the tariff bill considered on its merits. I am a protectionist. I believe that that policy, properly applied, is in the interest of all the people of the United States. It is now proposed by the amendments offered to make a general revision of the tariff out of an emergency tariff bill. I think everyone must concede that proper attention can not be given to it now and that the result is going to be most disappointing and, I repeat, a vain thing in the end, because it can not become a law.

Mr. President, I realize that Senators are introducing amendments here, knowing that it is a political thing that we are discussing, for the purpose of embarrassing other Senators when it comes to a vote on those amendments; and yet they do not want to lose the opportunity of getting into the Record a showing to their constituents that they have been faithful to the interests of those constituents. The business of the country is disturbed at present and in no condition for time here to be wasted in vain effort to get some little political advantage on one side or the other. I recognize the fact that if the original emergency bill as passed by the House had been enacted into law immediately it might possibly have brought some relief. I have some doubt even about that. I think it is unscientific legislation, and usually the temporary measures that are passed in an emergency result in detriment rather than benefit to the very people whom it is sought to benefit.

So, Mr. President, I am greatly disturbed. I am in charge of an appropriation bill which can, of course, go over until the next session, when the same work will have to be taken up again and the time of the Congress occupied when it ought to be devoted to the special matters that will be brought before Congress at that time. I had hoped that when it was discovered or disclosed beyond peradventure of doubt that the bill could not become a law at this time, that fact might be recognized and the matter laid aside and the regular business of the Senate proceeded with. I have been urged not to bring up the appropriation bill to which I have referred, and I have recognized the force of the argument, because I am told that the same filibuster which is maintaining now would be exerted on that bill if I should bring it up.

Other appropriation bills are awaiting the action of the Congress and especially of the Senate at this time. I hope if cloture should be defeated to-morrow that we may at least proceed with the business of the Senate, in order that action may be obtained upon measures which should become laws at this session.

I have said this much because I have felt very deeply the waste of time. No one is getting any benefit from the debate. It is not debate of the high character which is beneficial to the country, but it is more or less tainted by selfishness. I said I am a protectionist because I believe in the principle of it, and I believe a properly made tariff takes into consideration all those industries of the country which should be maintained here and which cost more to maintain due to labor than it does to maintain them in competing countries. I want the whole country considered as a unit and its relations established and recognized. That kind of a tariff is what the country wants.

That is what the country expects and what it ought to get. But how we are confusing things now by considering these various special matters. Consider the spectacle of these amendments coming in here, offered by men who have no sympathy with a protective tariff, but who feel that it is for their interest to be protectionists in their locality, to recognize the tariff as a local issue instead of a great national policy which, if properly carried out, means, in my judgment, the welfare of the whole country and of all of its people. I know we are injuring the very thing that we are seeking to accomplish or that we ought at least to seek to accomplish.

To-morrow if the vote for cloture is defeated, because I recognize it will be futile to do so before, I am, if opportunity presents, going to move to take up the Post Office appropriation bill. If Senators on the other side or on this side desire to filibuster against legitimate legislation of that kind, they can do so and they must assume the responsibility for their action, but I am going to attempt at least to give the Senate an opportunity to proceed with some of the business of the Senate, with the possible hope of accomplishing something before we adjourn.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] before he closed proceeded to build up a straw man and strike him down. He, like other Senators on the other side of the aisle, has been trying to create the impression that there was a filibuster in the Senate against the pending emergency tariff bill. If Senators on that side had utilized their time in a free and candid and open discussion of the provisions of the bill, the country would be better off.

Filibuster? There has been only 1 hour and 45 minutes of discussion of the bill by any Senator on the other side of the aisle in its favor, and that time was taken up by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], who has been faithful to the responsibilities that have been imposed upon him in having charge of the bill. He made a speech of 1 hour and 45 minutes on wheat. No other Senator on that side of the aisle, since the bill has been reported by the committee, has attempted to justify any of the provisions in the bill. When we who are opposed to the measure attempt a free discussion of it, attempt to point out the iniquities in it and the dangers that lurk within its provisions, then we are charged with conducting a filibuster.

I dare say that there has been less time consumed in the discussion of the pending bill up to the present moment than has been the case with any other important measure which was ever submitted to the Senate; and yet, for the second time in the history of the Senate of the United States, it is now proposed to gag the minority, to hamstring them, and so restrict them that a free discussion of the merits of the bill can not be entered into and the defects of the bill and the burdens which it would place upon the backs of the people exposed. Previous to the present occasion only once has the cloture rule been invoked in the Senate of the United States, and that was after an important question had been discussed not only for weeks, not only for months, but almost for a year. That question was as to the ratification of the treaty of Versailles.

In reference to the time devoted to other tariff bills, I note that the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was taken up for consideration in the Senate on April 19, 1909. It passed the Senate on July 8, 1909. There were practically three months of discussion on that important tariff bill in the Senate of the United States, while on the pending tariff bill we have had but an hour and forty-five minutes' discussion by any Senator on the other side in behalf of any provision of the bill.

I note that the Underwood tariff bill was taken up by the Senate on July 19, 1913, and passed the Senate on September 9, 1913. So there were practically two months of discussion of the Underwood tariff bill. There was no cloture. It was proper that there should have been, and there was, a free discussion of the merits of the bill; but here, with less than an hour and forty-five minutes of discussion by one Senator on the other side of the aisle on one provision of the bill, it is proposed to invoke a cloture rule in order to gag us and prevent our exposing its iniquities.

The nitrate bill, to which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] referred a few moments ago, was discussed here for four or five weeks before it was passed. There was constant discussion of the bill by Senators on both sides of the aisle. The bill providing reciprocity with Canada was reported to the Senate on June 13, 1911, and passed the Senate July 22, 1911. There was practically a month and a half of discussion in the Senate, but cloture was not resorted to in that case.

Oh, Senators of the majority, you are going pretty far when you even ask us to vote on such a measure as this, but certainly you should allow those who oppose it opportunity for free discussion in order that the people of the country may be en-

lightened in reference to its provisions. The bill as reported contains 18 or more items, all of which are important. Among them are found some of the most important items included in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law or in the Underwood law, and yet only one Senator, of all the Senators on the other side of the aisle, has attempted to give his reasons for supporting any of its provisions, and those reasons were confined only to the provision touching wheat. Neither the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] nor the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], who are well versed in the wool schedule, who stood here in 1909 and had to withstand the attacks not only of Democratic Senators but of Republican-Progressive Senators in their defense of Schedule K of that bill, has attempted to justify what is proposed to be done in the wool schedule which is contained in the pending measure.

In my brief discussion of the bill some days ago, I pointed out a "joker" in the phraseology of the provision touching wool, which makes the duty imposed on the raw wool not 15 cents but 30 cents, and yet the Senator from Utah has not as yet attempted to defend the proposition or to explain the provision relative to wool. So I might follow down the line until the sugar provisions are reached. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] attempted to defend the duty proposed on sugar; but as to the other provisions of the bill, of which we have a right to a full explanation, we have not had any character of explanation up to the present time.

Senators on the other side of the aisle know that if cloture should to-morrow be adopted by a two-thirds vote amendments will be restricted and limited; that debate will be limited; and no Senator can speak over 60 minutes on any amendment which may be proposed to the bill or on any provision which it now contains or on the bill itself.

There may be method in your madness; I do not know. I know that certain proposed legislation in which the country is deeply interested, and which passed the other House months ago and was referred to committees of the Senate, has been allowed to sleep there up until this good day. Senators can not fool the men who are interested in that legislation. When they vote for the rule of cloture they prevent such proposed legislation being offered as amendments to the bill.

Senators on the other side, who are now supporting the bill, told the soldiers who fought in the late war that they desired to help them; they have written letters to them and advised them that if the opportunity presented itself on the floor of the Senate they would vote for a bonus bill; on the hustings in their campaign they told the soldier boys that they wanted to help them; and yet, although back in May or June of last year the House of Representatives passed a soldiers' bonus bill, which when it came here was referred to the great Committee on Finance of the Senate, the committee which so quickly reported out the so-called emergency tariff bill in a week's time after it came to the Senate from the other House, that bill has been allowed apparently to sleep the sleep of the just, for it still remains before that committee. Having the bonus bill in charge, the Committee on Finance could have added it as an amendment to the pending bill. I signified my intention of offering it as an amendment to this bill, and asked the Committee on Finance in considering the emergency tariff legislation to consider the amendment; to add it as an amendment to the bill; but the Finance Committee voted it down. Ordinarily that would not defeat the measure; it could be offered as an amendment on the floor of the Senate, though it might take a two-thirds vote in order to suspend the rules for that purpose, but we should have had the opportunity of doing it. However, if the cloture rule shall be adopted, no amendment which is not germane can be offered, and we shall probably be estopped from offering the bonus measure as an amendment to the bill.

So there may be method in the madness of the leaders on the other side of the aisle in proposing cloture and trying to cram it down our throats; it may be that they are afraid to face the American soldier or to vote as to whether or not they are in favor of granting him a bonus. Senators on the other side of the aisle who have signed the motion for cloture and who propose to put it over to-morrow will have to answer to the soldiers for their action.

There are other amendments which are also important and which, if cloture shall be adopted, will be excluded from consideration in connection with this measure. I refer, for instance, to the immigration amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who has just made his able speech criticizing the so-called emergency tariff bill. Senators on the other side of the aisle know as well as I do that unless we can get the immigration bill reported out

of the committee or otherwise bring that question before the Senate for discussion and have a vote on it at a very early date, it will be impossible to pass any legislation on that important question at this session. The so-called Johnson bill passed the House some weeks, in fact, I might say months, ago; it came to the Senate, and the Senate Committee on Immigration have been having prolonged hearings on the question. There are some members of the committee who are in favor of reporting out that bill as it was passed by the House and who have been in favor of voting it out ever since it was referred to the committee, but a majority of the committee are opposed to the Johnson bill, in my opinion. So it appears to me that little opportunity will be offered to the majority of the Senate who at this time are favorable to proposed legislation restricting immigration into this country to vote their convictions, and, unless we can consider it in connection with the emergency tariff bill, perhaps we shall be estopped during this Congress from its consideration.

It has been stated that 15,000,000 foreigners are clamoring for steerage accommodations in order that they may come to America. Eastern Europe, it is said, is swarming with people seeking passports and desirous of coming to this country. Their coming, of course, can only result in battering down the present prices of wages and adding to the burdens which now confront the American people. Of course, I do not believe any such number as that can possibly come to the United States, but I believe that the desire is there, and in far too many cases undesirable elements from other countries desirous of coming to our shores are only prevented from doing so because of the lack of steamship facilities. It is an important question, particularly in view of the fact that men are out of employment from one end of this country to the other, that bread lines have been formed, and that trucks beneath the railroad cars, which have not for a long time been used by the blind-baggage fraternity, by those who beat their way, are now filled with tramps going from one place to another. And so it is as much incumbent upon the Senate of the United States to consider that question as it is to consider the question now pending before the Senate.

There is another amendment that I have proposed which, if this cloture should be adopted, will in all probability be excluded from the consideration of the Senate. That is an amendment that really proposes to do something for the American farmer; yet that amendment carries nothing in its lines that tries to deceive him, that would hoodwink him, that would play hypocritically upon his credulity, but it would really render some service, give some substantial benefit to him. That amendment which I propose, and which I have been extremely desirous of having the Senate vote upon and pass, is to create in this country some rural credit banks, and to have the Government take over enough of their bonds to lend money to the farmers at this time, so they can tide themselves over until better times come.

I know the deplorable conditions that the farmers of America in practically every locality throughout the country are now facing, and I do not believe that the farmers of any part of the country are in worse straits and have to face greater burdens than the farmers of my State are now confronting; but I am not willing, Senators, to go against a principle which I have always held dear or to give my sanction to a measure under which in order to help one person you have to rob ninety-nine other persons. I am not willing to indorse by my vote the specious argument that some of you have made to the farmers since the beginning of your political careers in the effort to make them believe that a tax on foodstuffs produced in this country, where we are shipping abroad to the markets of the world and have a surplus to ship, will protect them.

In my opinion the bill is all wrong from every standpoint; and yet, with the small amount of explanation that you have already given us, with the slight explanation you have made of only one item in the bill, you propose now under this rule to invoke cloture in the United States Senate. I am in favor of a revision of the rules. I have tried as a member of the Rules Committee of the Senate to revise the rules. I shall cooperate with every Senator here in a revision of the rules, but I do not propose at this time to lend my voice and my vote to a coterie of Senators who would try to invoke a rule to pass a bill that would add to the burdens of the consumers of the country.

Let me read what some of the Senators of the Republican Party have said about this tariff on food products, a surplus of which is produced in this country and is sold in the markets of the world.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. I wish to offer a very short amendment and have it read, if the Senator will permit me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). The amendment will be read.

The Journal Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 11, insert after the word "pound" the following: "Starch made from potatoes, 3 cents per pound; natural potato flour, 2½ cents per pound."

Mr. HARRISON. Here is what the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], on the 22d of June, 1909, said in answer to a question as to whether he believed that the duty on wheat affected the price of wheat:

I do not. . . . I want Senators to remember that I come from a State which probably puts more in value into the channels of trade every year than any State in the Union in agricultural products. We will this year supply the people of the United States and the people of the world with a product that will surpass the value of \$700,000,000, and it is idle for even an enthusiast to assert that the price of these products is directly affected by the protective tariff.

That is quite different from the views entertained by the Senator from North Dakota; but I find here quotations from a speech that was made by the Senator from North Dakota himself on June 22, 1909. Here is what the Senator from North Dakota then said:

The wheat acreage to-day is producing a surplus of wheat which must be thrown into the world's market, thereby keeping down the price of the home product, tariff or no tariff.

I know not what has come over the spirit of the dreams of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota; but back in the better days of 1909, when he was an expert on the wheat tariff, he employs the language that—

The wheat acreage to-day is producing a surplus of wheat which must be thrown into the world's market, thereby keeping down the price of the home product, tariff or no tariff.

Here is what the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] said on this subject on the 10th of May, 1909. This is good reading, because it answers the argument that has been made by the Senator from North Dakota much better than anything that I might say or that the Senator from North Carolina might say. Here is what the Senator's colleague, the able Senator from Minnesota, says:

I do not recall the millions of bushels produced in the State of Minnesota, but I desire to tell the Senator that the tariff on wheat which is on the statute books has not done us a particle of good. It would be like a tariff on cotton, because up to this time we have been exporting from 150,000,000 to 250,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. The price of our wheat is fixed by the Liverpool price—the export price—and no duty up to this time has helped us.

Those were the views of Republican Senators who have studied this question.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator. I think I should.

Mr. McCUMBER. I presume what the Senator means, and what the Senator from Minnesota also meant, is that the American price is fixed by the Liverpool price, of course; but the Liverpool price would be the American price plus the cost of transportation, would it not?

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad that that explanation suits the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am asking the Senator a question. If he thinks that the Liverpool price fixes the American price, the American price must necessarily be the Liverpool price, less the cost of transportation, must it not?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; and the same thing applies to Canada.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well. At the very time that the Senator was making that speech, the price at Liverpool and at Minneapolis was nearly the same, and had remained practically the same, irrespective of the matter of transportation, for nearly a year. Now, if that was true, how did it happen then that the Liverpool price should govern, if, as a matter of fact, the Minneapolis price of wheat, as it was, was quoted here for a long time exactly the same as the Liverpool price?

I can tell the Senator why that was so, and what I can tell the Senator will be in full accordance with my quoted statement which he has just given.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has already attempted to tell the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, but I can tell the Senator. It is not an attempt to tell, but I can tell him why it was so.

Mr. HARRISON. I will let the Senator tell in his own time.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well.

Mr. HARRISON. I am reading from what he said in 1909.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. HARRISON. It is quite different from the position the Senator is taking in this debate.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is not one whit different from the position that the Senator has taken to-day.

Mr. HARRISON. Then we are together.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has taken a little portion of what was said. He has not followed the argument that was made at that time. There is no question but that when we have a large surplus that large surplus necessarily affects the price of wheat; but the Senator has never heard me say at any time that a tariff did not benefit us at all. Of course, a big surplus will depress the market, tariff or no tariff. That is true.

Mr. HARRISON. Why, of course, a big surplus affects the market.

Mr. McCUMBER. No one has ever denied that.

Mr. HARRISON. And it affects it just as much in Canada as it affects it in the United States; and the only reason why there is any difference between the Winnipeg market and the Minneapolis market is about the same reason that there is a difference between the Minneapolis market and the Chicago market. I remember when I was a boy down in southern Mississippi that the great market for long-staple cotton was Vicksburg. Long trains of cotton went from distant points to Vicksburg, because that was a place where the farmers could find a better market. It is true everywhere that one place may be a better market for certain products than another place, and Minneapolis may be a better market than Winnipeg; but the price of wheat is fixed in the markets of the world, and Liverpool fixes the price of wheat.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why should Duluth, which is on one side of the lake, quote for years a price above Port Arthur, on the other side of the lake, when wheat on both sides can be shipped to Liverpool for exactly the same price?

Mr. HARRISON. It may be for the same reason that you can get a better price by carrying some chickens to Chicago than you can get for them at some place a few miles away.

Mr. McCUMBER. That does not answer the question.

Mr. HARRISON. No; I can not answer the Senator's question.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly, the Senator can not answer it.

Mr. HARRISON. But if the Senator has his way, and this bill protects the wheat farmers of the Northwest and gives them some benefit, then he is bound to admit that the consumers of the country have to pay that benefit to those farmers?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator just the other day stated that this proposed protection of 40 cents a bushel on wheat would not affect the consumers of flour very much. That is what I understood the Senator to say.

Mr. McCUMBER. I stated exactly what it would amount to at 50 cents a bushel. I did not compute it at 40 cents a bushel; but if every cent was carried into the barrel of flour it would be four and a half times 40 cents.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. And inasmuch as the consumer consumes one barrel of flour per year per capita, it would cost him that much additional for a whole year, and I stated that that would be equivalent to the carpenter having to work a quarter of a day longer during the whole year in order to pay the farmer 40 cents more a bushel for his grain.

Mr. HARRISON. That is what I understood the Senator to say, that the provision on wheat in this bill alone would compel the laboring man in America to work a quarter of a day more a year. There are approximately about 30,000,000 people who have to work for a living in this country. In other words, the tax that is imposed on wheat alone in this bill, just one of the items, will require 30,000,000 laboring people in this country to work a quarter of a day longer in a year. In other words, on that basis, it would compel seven and a half million laboring people in this country to work a day a year longer.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, will the Senator look on the other side of the picture for a moment?

Mr. HARRISON. I am looking on this side of the picture now.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator look on the other side for a moment? The Senator seems to forget that there are two sides to this question. When we protect the American laborer from Chinese immigration and Japanese immigration and from the labor-contract system; when we protect him by a tariff—and I will admit that the tariff does help him get better wages; when we give him protection from every side and he can earn from 6 to 10 dollars a day, is there an injustice in protecting the farmer so that he can increase his earnings about 50 cents a day? That is about all there is in it.

Mr. HARRISON. There is a great deal of injustice.

Mr. McCUMBER. There are 30,000,000 people on the farms, too, who have just as much interest in this matter, and in having their wages raised to a living standard, as those who live in the cities. I want to equalize the two classes. I want to help out the farmer so that he can receive compensation for his labor that will, to a certain extent, or at least as nearly as possible, measure up to the compensation that is paid to the laborers and the earners in every city in the Union.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the Senator know, as I was about to say when he interrupted me, that according to the figures the Senator has himself given, the increased price of wheat alone, as provided for in this bill, would cause the laboring man to work a quarter of a day a year more, or that it would cause seven and a half million laboring men to work a whole day more, or that 21,310 laboring men would have to work a whole year in order to pay this tax you would impose upon the consumers of the country?

But that is not all. That is only one of the provisions of this bill, and every one of the other 18 provisions is intended likewise to burden the consumers of the country.

The Senator gave his estimate on sugar, and I believe it was adhered to by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], or it may be the Senator from Utah said it; at any rate, we all agree that the tax on sugar proposed in this bill will be anywhere from one hundred and sixty to three hundred million dollars on the American consumer. There is a difference there, but the difference is only between one hundred and sixty and three hundred million dollars, and the iniquity of the bill has revealed itself so strongly that even it has melted the heart of the Senator from Utah, and to-day he proposes to cut down the tariff which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and other Senators on the other side of the aisle who are members of the Finance Committee, voted to bring out of the committee. I am glad your hearts are melting, and if this debate has done nothing more than it has done in that one instance, it will save the American consumer over a hundred million dollars.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not want to disturb the Senator—

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not disturb me.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator understand the difference of viewpoint, and the reason for it, between the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HARRISON. I understand the difference.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator understand—

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has asked me a question, if he will permit me to answer it. I am more familiar with the difference in the viewpoints of the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Utah, and my own.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not expressed myself—

Mr. HARRISON. And if I understand the viewpoint of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Utah, both are trying to place a tariff on sugar which will help the producers of the country and at the same time place a burden of over a hundred million dollars on the American consumer. I am opposed to that.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator does not express at all the difference in their views on this subject. There has already been a contract made, and was made before the beets were ever planted in Utah, that the sugar manufacturer would pay a certain price for the beets. So the farmer in Utah is protected. He is getting his price, whether the manufacturer loses or not. I think the Senator from Utah claims that the manufacturer of beet sugar in Utah will lose about \$4 a hundred in the manufacture. Therefore he may not feel as deeply impressed with the dire necessity for the protection of the Utah farmer as the Senator from Louisiana feels the necessity of protecting the Louisiana cane growers. He represents a constituency which has not had the benefit of a protection. While I admit freely that it will cost the American people very much more, probably, for their sugar than they would pay if no such bill were enacted, the question often comes back to my mind, What will the American consumer pay for his sugar when you have destroyed the beet raising in this country and the cane-sugar production in this country and leave the country subject entirely to combinations made outside of the United States, over which we have no control?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Mississippi allow me to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask the Senator from North Dakota if it is not true that the beet-sugar crop is entirely out of the hands of the farmer. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I understand not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have that information from the Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture. They have advised me that the beet sugar, in line with what the Senator said

just a few moments ago, was bought in advance, that it has already been sold, and if this bill passes it will not benefit the sugar grower at all, but will benefit only the manufacturer or the middleman, in whose hands the crop is now.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let us see, if the Senator wants an answer to that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would be very glad to have one.

Mr. McCUMBER. At the start, I understand that about 20 per cent is still in the hands of the producer. But be that as it may, we are coming to the spring of the year. The farmer of Utah must determine whether or not he will plant his beet seed. If he could get the assurance or the guaranty from the manufacturer of sugar that he has this year, of course he would plant the seed again. But he will get no such guaranty from them this year, because on that guaranty they have lost about \$4 on every 100 pounds. Unless they get an assurance of a price which would justify them in planting the seed, they will not plant them this spring, and if we have no tariff bill at the present time, nothing to indicate that there will be any protection, I for one doubt whether the beet-sugar industry will survive another year in Utah. However, I am willing to abide to a considerable extent by the judgment of the Senators from Utah, who undoubtedly understand the beet-sugar situation there much better than I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, as I understand the Senator, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield to me just a moment more, the purpose of this bill is not to help the sugar grower directly, but is for the purpose of putting into the pockets of the Sugar Trust, out of the pockets of the American people, a fund sufficient to enable the Sugar Trust to bid a little higher price on next year's crop of sugar beets.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator knows, because it has been stated here again and again, that the purpose of this bill, so far as it affects the sugar duties, is to maintain sugar production in the United States. Whether it will fail to do that is another question. I believe that the interests of the American people will be better subserved if we keep alive that industry in the United States. I know there are those who take a different view; but that is my protection idea of the subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, as I understand the Senator, it is not proposed by this bill to help the beet-sugar farmer, but it is proposed simply to raise a fund out of the American people and put it into the pockets of the Sugar Trust—

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, that is demagoguery. The Senator understands, just as well as I do, that if we are going to protect the American farmer for next year in the production of beets in Utah, and if we can pass this for 10 months, he will be justified in planting his crop, and he will raise a crop in less than 10 months and can sell it in less than 10 months, and he will be benefited to that extent. The Senator has no right to say to me that the only object of this bill, and that I concede the only object of this bill, is to put money into the hands of the beet-sugar manufacturer.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has said that it would do the sugar grower no good.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have said nothing of the kind. I have just now explained wherein it will help out the farmer in Utah. I have explained wherein it will help out the farmer in Louisiana, who depends entirely upon the cane-sugar industry for his livelihood.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, let us take that horn of the dilemma. Let us take what the Senator says about that. This tax is imposed now. It benefits directly the Sugar Trust now. The Senator says it will benefit next year's crop. Why would the Sugar Trust be willing to pay more or contract to pay more now for next year's crop of sugar when they know of a certainty that in 10 months there will be no tariff? Will the Senator from North Dakota answer that question?

Mr. McCUMBER. If by the defeat of the bill they will know to a certainty that there will be no tariff, of course, then they will decline to pay any more for the beets than they would pay under absolute free trade.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. The Senator admits that at present the benefits of the bill will go to those who now own the beet-sugar crop or who have bought the beet-sugar crop. During 10 months by the provisions of the bill there will be an increased tariff. Why should they offer any advanced or bigger price when they know there will be no tariff on it 10 months from now?

Mr. McCUMBER. Is the Senator such a prophet that he can say that in 10 months from now there will be no tariff on sugar?

Mr. McKELLAR. By the very terms of the bill it ends in 10 months.

Mr. McCUMBER. That does not mean that there will be no tariff in 10 months. It ends in 10 months simply because we will have a general tariff bill before the expiration of that time, and the Senator from Tennessee can rest absolutely assured, and need have no dream even to the contrary, that there will be a tariff on sugar.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this debate is quite interesting, but we have heard so much about sugar that I am tiring of it. I do not agree with the Senator from Tennessee that the tariff is not going to last 10 months, even if it should be incorporated in the present bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill provides on its face that it is to last for only 10 months.

Mr. HARRISON. That is quite true.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are considering the pending bill. We are not considering a bill that may be introduced at the next session of Congress. I believe, of course, that there will be a tariff bill brought in, and probably it will include a tariff on sugar. They may double the rate now on sugar.

Mr. HARRISON. I say I think the Senator is mistaken, and I make that assertion because we know what the plan of the opposition is on the proposition. Every provision of taxation that they impose as carried in this bill will be carried into permanent bills that they will put forth. The Senator from Tennessee says the bill lasts only 10 months, but when we come to consider the next tariff bill in the extra session the farmers of the country will write letters to every Senator and say, "For goodness sake, do not let them reduce the tariff on wool, on wheat, on flour, on butter, on milk, on live stock," and on every other article that is incorporated in this bill.

That is where I differ with the Senator from Tennessee, in that the provisions of the bill will expire in 10 months. The bill will expire, but with the Republican Party in control of both branches of Congress and a Republican President in the White House, and with that party revising the tariff, it would take a crazy man to presume that they would revise it downward. The most that the people can hope for if the bill should become a law is that the Republican Party will not increase the rates when they tamper with it during the extra session of Congress.

But as the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Tennessee were discussing sugar, and there is some question arising as to the position of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] on the question of sugar, the thought that came to me was that the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Utah and the Senator from North Dakota are all striving to show, whether they intend to put a 1-cent tariff on sugar or a 2-cent tariff on sugar, as it is in the bill, that it will necessarily increase the cost of sugar. Whether it goes into the refiners' pockets or into the pockets of the producers of cane or the producers of beets or the contractors or what not, the burden must be borne by the American consumer of sugar. The burden will be lessened if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah should be adopted reducing the tax proposed by the Committee on Finance of the Senate. But no matter which amendment is adopted, what you are going to do is to lay a greater burden upon the consumers of sugar in the country. In one instance it will be over \$100,000,000 and in the other instance it will be practically \$300,000,000.

When I think of that I can not forget this pamphlet to which I referred the other day and to which the attention of the Senate has been called, the pamphlet that was distributed by the Republican Party in the last campaign, with great headlines, "Why 25-Cent Sugar," sent to every remote section of the United States and placed on the table in the sitting room of every laboring man in the country. Reprint after reprint was made by the Republican national committee and mailed by the Republican managers, "Why 25-Cent Sugar?"

They said in it:

Those who hold in the hollow of their hands the supply of sugar know that the American people will buy it, no matter at what price it may be sold.

They were appealing for votes at that time. They were criticizing the administration in power because sugar had gone up in price to the American consumer. They were attempting to create prejudice there, trying to make people believe that if they were elected they would reduce the price of sugar; that the general high cost of living would come down; and that they would be interested in the man who had to purchase food and clothing.

The results of this policy are painful in the extreme. Having in mind the total consumption of sugar in the United States, every time sugar is raised 1 cent per pound the American people are forced to take out of their pockets \$90,000,000.

That is what they said in their campaign. That is what they said to the American voter, endeavoring to make him believe that they had some interest in him, and that they would consider his wants when they got into power. They closed the pamphlet by saying:

The poor plundered citizen, struggling to feed and clothe his family, naturally complains of the high cost of living. But it is better to think than to complain. Consider.

They believed, when the wage earner who was making just about enough to make ends meet sat around his hearthstone at night in the later days of October and was handed that pamphlet and read it, that it would make a deep impression on him, and that it would move him to vote the Republican ticket in November.

So after they had distributed such literature as that I am amazed at the audacity they display in coming here so soon after the people rendered the verdict in their favor and proposing this tariff on sugar that will cost the consumers from \$150,000,000 to \$300,000,000.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am sure the Senator will be interested in having some concrete facts stated showing to just what extent the proposed tariff legislation will affect the cost of living to the consumers of the country.

I have had prepared an estimate of the number of barrels of flour consumed per annum in my State—Massachusetts—and the increase in cost of each barrel of flour. I have been startled at the tremendous burden that these figures indicate will be imposed upon the people of America. I do not think we have any conception of how much the already increased cost of living may be advanced as the result of this legislation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does not the Senator mean, always provided the tariff raises the price of wheat, as its proponents contend it will?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Exactly; and, of course, there is no other purpose for this tariff legislation except to increase the income of the producer, which can only result in increasing the price the consumer must pay for wheat and the other products named in this bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. Do I understand the Senator to say that he has figures showing an increase in the price of wheat?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have figures prepared upon the assumption that the cost of wheat will increase to the amount of the tariff rate named in the proposed legislation.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator believe the assumption? That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is possible for it to be increased to the amount named, and therefore I must believe it may happen.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then the Senator does believe that the bill will raise the price of wheat 40 cents a bushel?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not know whether it will or not, but I say it is possible for it to be increased 40 cents per bushel. No one can dispute that possibility. This bill, indeed, tends to make it possible for the producer to demand 40 cents more for wheat.

Mr. McCUMBER. I was trying to get the Senator's candid opinion as to whether it would raise the price 40 cents a bushel, or any number of cents a bushel.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Can anyone tell?

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, if the Senator can not tell, of course, he can not tell whether the figures he produces are at all correct.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. That is true; but I do know that this legislation is framed for the purpose of adding 40 cents a bushel to that price which the producer might expect to get without this tariff rate. Therefore, I have a right to assume that conditions may arise which will cause the cost to the consumer to be increased 40 cents per bushel. Otherwise why not fix the rate at 20 cents or 10 cents or 5 cents? Because the advocates of this measure want to make it possible for the producer to get 40 cents more, and that is why they have fixed the rate at 40 cents.

The figures I have had compiled show that there is consumed in Massachusetts in a given year approximately 22,500,000 bushels of wheat. On the assumption that the cost will increase 40 cents per bushel, the consumers must pay \$9,000,000 more per annum. Reducing this to flour, I find that the increased cost to the consumer would be about \$2.25 per barrel.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator yield to me right there?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCUMBER. Did the Senator give the increased cost per barrel of flour as being \$2.25 as the result of the imposition of a tax of 40 cents a bushel on wheat?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. For flour; yes, sir.

Mr. McCUMBER. How does the Senator arrive at those figures? It takes 4½ bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour. Four and a half times 40 cents is not \$2.25.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The figures have been prepared for me by an expert and have been calculated very accurately, in answer to an inquiry by me as to just what the increased cost per barrel of flour would be to the consumers of Massachusetts.

Mr. McCUMBER. The expert is probably off on his arithmetic.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The increased cost of the price of bread per loaf is estimated as being about 1 cent—to be accurate, six-tenths of a cent.

Now, assuming a family of six—a workingman, his wife, and four children—and having in mind the average consumption of each individual, I find that a family using wheat, beans, potatoes, onions, rice, fresh meat, butter, cheese, milk, and sugar will be obliged to pay—assuming the increased cost which this tariff rate provides—over \$50 per year more for the commodities named, and which we all will agree are most essential to the life of the working people of this country. On a basis of 750,000 families—and that is the estimate for the State of Massachusetts—and estimating this increased cost for 10 months, the term named in this bill, the amount taken from the consuming public of this one State for the few articles named is estimated as being about \$37,000,000. I thought the Senator from Mississippi would be interested in having those figures presented and I read for his information as well as for the consuming public a carefully prepared table of what may be expected in increased cost of living if this bill is enacted into law. This table is presented for the purpose of showing a family weekly budget for certain necessary articles used by American families, the price of which will be increased by these tariff rates.

Family (6) weekly budget for certain articles.

Article.	Estimated consumption.	Additional duty.	Added cost.
Wheat.....	14 loaves.....	\$0.14	\$0.14
Beans.....	4 pounds.....	.24	.08
Potatoes.....	1½ packages.....	.06½	.11
Onions.....	½ package.....	.05	.01
Rice.....	2 pounds.....	.01	.02
Fresh meat.....	12 pounds.....	.02	.24
Butter.....	2 pounds.....	.05½	.11
Cheese.....	1 pound.....	.01	.01
Milk.....	10 quarts.....	.05	.05
Sugar.....	11 pounds.....	.03½	.39
Total.....			1.16

750,000 families in Massachusetts. Weekly increase in cost of these foods \$870,000, or about \$37,500,000 for 10 months.

Mr. HARRISON. I am very much interested in having them presented. They merely show how the Republicans keep their promises.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, it is very easy to extend the calculation which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has furnished so as to make the figures apply, so far as wheat is concerned, to the whole country. It is estimated that we consume in this country 1½ barrels of flour per annum per capita. There are over 100,000,000 people in this country. That would mean an annual consumption of over 150,000,000 barrels of flour. Undoubtedly, if the proposed rate should be effective in raising the prices to the extent of the duty, the increase in the price of flour would be at least \$2 per barrel. It would be more than that, probably, but it would be at least that much. So that an increase of \$2 a barrel, 150,000,000 barrels of flour being consumed, would impose a tax upon the users of flour in this country amounting to \$300,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. But, Mr. President, not only would the proponents of this bill impose an unreasonable and stupendous burden on those who use flour, if the position of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is correct touching the tariff on wheat, not only would a tremendous and unreasonable amount be imposed upon the users of sugar, but equally tremendous and unreasonable charges would be imposed in connection with many other articles which the people must use.

Take corn. A tariff of 15 cents a bushel on corn is proposed, when there is not as much corn imported into the United States as is raised in one county in the State of Ohio or Illinois. There is no need in the world for a tariff on corn. If the

theory of the Senator from North Dakota is correct that the tariff on food products helps the farmer in his price, then we should increase the burden of those who even choose to eat corn bread in the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator might also cite the tax of 2 cents a pound on meat. Assuming that that tax will raise the price of meat 2 cents a pound, and basing the calculation on the amount of meat consumed by each person in the United States as being 193 pounds a year to each person, it will mean between \$3.80 and \$4 each, or an additional tax upon the meat consumers of the country of about \$400,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; paragraph 14 provides:

14. Fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, 2 cents per pound. Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for herein, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Everything that a man must eat in order to live is taxed in this so-called emergency tariff bill. Not only will greater burdens be imposed on those who eat wheat bread, corn bread, biscuits, and sugar, but the friends of this measure propose a tax on meat.

Whom will that help? In the discussion on the packer bill it was revealed whom that would help. The fact is, as shown by the report of the Federal Trade Commission that 75 per cent of the meat supply of the country is controlled by the five big packers; that 60 per cent of the dressed poultry and eggs shipped in the United States is controlled by the five big packers; that 82 per cent of the cattle slaughtered in interstate commerce is controlled by the five big packers; that 61 per cent of the hogs which are butchered in interstate commerce is controlled by the five big packers; that 80 per cent of the sheep that are butchered in interstate commerce is controlled by the five big packers; that 49½ per cent of all the poultry that is killed and enters interstate commerce is controlled by the five big packers; and yet, with the five big packers having a stranglehold on the fresh-meat supply and on the cattle, the sheep, and the hogs which are butchered in this country and enter interstate commerce, it is proposed by this bill to levy a tax of 2 cents a pound on fresh meats and an additional tax on live stock imported into this country. To whom do you wish to give the benefit? I will not say it is peculiar; but it is merely a coincidence that some of the Senators who upon this floor fought the packers' bill are those who are championing most earnestly the pending measure. This is the way it is proposed by the Republican majority to tax the consumers of the country.

Even eggs and butter have not been left out of the provisions of the bill. If there is any consumer in Washington who has been able to buy eggs at any reasonable price in a long time I should like to see the color of his eyes. Eggs soared from 75 cents a dozen up to over \$1 a dozen—

Mr. POMERENE. To \$1.05.

Mr. HARRISON. To \$1.05, I am told by the Senator from Ohio; and yet by this bill it is proposed to levy a tariff on eggs which enter the United States.

On milk the bill imposes a tax of 2 cents a gallon. Emisaries have gone forth; organizations have been perfected; appeals have been made; great pictures and posters have been printed in order to appeal to the people of the United States for funds with which to relieve hunger and distress amongst the Armenians, the Belgians, and other nations of Europe, and in order that the little children in countries devastated by the war might have milk; yet in this country it is proposed by this bill to impose a tariff of 2 cents a gallon on milk and 5 cents a gallon on cream.

Hardly a commodity which is used on the table of the average American citizen has been left out of the bill. As was pointed out yesterday by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], a greatly increased tax is proposed to be levied on beans, which the poor people of the country eat, which are practically indispensable, and which are especially popular in the city from which the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] comes. On beans on which in the Underwood tariff law a duty of 25 cents a bushel is levied and in the Payne-Aldrich law a duty of 45 cents a bushel, by this bill it is proposed to levy a tax of \$1.20 a bushel for the purpose of protection. That is the way the consumer of the country is being treated by a Republican Congress so soon after they promised the people that they would reduce the high cost of living.

On hides of cattle, which the packers control, there is a tariff of 15 per cent ad valorem levied. The provision reads:

On hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Yet I find from the report of the Federal Trade Commission and the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate that of the hides stored in the United States, 89.2 per cent is held by the five big packers. So you want further to protect the five big packers, who control 89.2 per cent, by levying this 15 per cent duty on hides that enter the United States.

Let me read you what a distinguished Republican wrote to another distinguished Republican about the tariff on hides. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6, 1909, a letter from James G. Blaine, one of the ablest and most influential men of his day. He was writing this letter to a martyred former President of your own party. It reads:

WASHINGTON, April 10, 1890.

DEAR MR. McKINLEY: It is a great mistake to take hides from the free list, where they have been for so many years. It is a slap in the face of the South Americans, with whom we are trying to enlarge our trade. It will benefit the farmer by adding 5 to 8 per cent to the price of his children's shoes.

It will yield a profit to the butcher only, the last man that needs it. The movement is injudicious from beginning to end, in every form and phase.

Please stop it before it sees light. Such movements as this for protection will protect the Republican Party only into speedy retirement.

Very hastily,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

And so the Finance Committee, controlled by the party that controls this Chamber, has gone back on some of the teachings of its great men, as some Senators on this side, it seems, would go back on the traditions of their party.

Hides? Whom does this tariff help? Why, the five big packers, as I have pointed out, control 89.2 per cent of the hides that are stored in the United States to-day, and the Senators who have investigated the question know that the whole leather business is controlled by about three big corporations in this country. And so you propose, if the views of the Senator from North Dakota are correct, not only to make the bread of the wage earner cost more, to make his butter cost more, to make his milk cost more, to make his sugar cost more, to make his oils cost more, to make his beans and innumerable other articles cost more, but you have gone to the matter of shoes and may compel him to pay more for shoes than he has been paying in the past; and goodness knows shoes have cost enough already. I quoted the other day a price list of shoes ranging up to \$15 a pair. Why, for the last two years you could hardly buy a pair of child's shoes that would last three weeks for less than \$6 or \$7 a pair, and as soon as they begin to go down a little we find that you propose to pass a bill that will lift the price up again!

What did you mean when you told the American people less than three months ago that you were going to remedy the situation touching the high cost of living? Are you admitting now by this bill that you did not mean one iota of what you said? Those who vote for cloture to-morrow, those who vote for this bill upon its final passage, will repudiate every promise that they made to the American people. They are not easily fooled. The people from one end of this country to another know what lurks in this bill. They know what it means to the American wheat producer along the Canadian border. They know what it means to the beet producer and the sugar refiner and the sugar-cane producer. They know what it means to the man who grows wool or who has wool stored, and the man knows, too, who is working all day to support his family in the employ of a corporation that is threatening to reduce his wages. He is reading about the burdens that you are attempting to impose on him. He is sitting around his hearthstone figuring with his wife, perhaps, just how much more it will take to live after this bill has become a law; and these streams of people throughout the country who are standing ready and waiting for their chance to go into the offices of the employment bureaus seeking a job know about this bill and what greater burdens will be placed upon them should it become a law.

Those men by the thousands in Detroit and Toledo and Akron and New York City, and in every city throughout the country, who, because plants have been closed, sit around morning and noon and night expressing doubt as to the factory opening up at a certain time, hoping that it will not be long before they can be employed again, know that this bill is pending, and that to-morrow, at 1 o'clock, you who so lately promised the American people relief, you who less than three months ago said that you would reduce the high cost of living, will try to pass through the Senate a cloture rule that will gag Senators in debate, and restrict them in the freedom of their actions; and they know what the passage of that cloture rule will mean—that it will mean that this bill will perhaps become a law, and with it everything that goes upon the breakfast table, almost everything

that they wear, from clothes made out of wool and cotton down to shoes and boots upon their feet, will be increased in price to them.

Yes; you have thrown in long-staple cotton here, and that provision has caught some fellows. They raise 28,000 bales of long-staple cotton in the State of Arizona, and they want some protection on it. Why, God bless you, there is one county in the State of Mississippi that raises nearly four times as much long-staple cotton as that. Bolivar County, Miss., has raised as many as 96,000 bales of long-staple cotton in a year. The Delta of Mississippi raises more long-staple cotton than almost all the other States in the United States combined. We raise 49 per cent of the long-staple cotton that is raised in the United States, and yet you can not catch my vote by an iniquitous protective tariff upon that article simply because it is raised in my State. I would not have the hardihood to vote against protection on any other article if I stood here for protection on the articles that are produced in my State. You have got to stand for the principle of a thing. The Democratic Party has always stood for that. It has never believed in bleeding the many in order to aid the few. It has never stood for protection on live stock at the expense of the consuming masses, or protection on meat and sugar and butter and eggs and cheese and fresh meats and a lot of other things that you propose to protect in this bill.

It has stood for a revenue tariff, and will always stand for a revenue tariff.

I have had Democratic Senators and Congressmen, who have tried to excuse their position and justify their action, say to me: "Oh, any revenue tariff carries with it protection." That argument does not go. A Democrat can not justify his position in voting for this bill if he wants to follow the principles of his party and the teachings of the fathers of the party. And I do not see how a Republican, I do not care how wicked he may have become, can vote for the provisions of this bill.

Why, take wool, for instance. A tariff of 11 cents on wool is carried in the Payne-Aldrich bill, Schedule K, which was condemned from one end of this country to the other. It was the cornerstone upon which the Payne-Aldrich bill was written. It was repudiated by your own party's leader as well as by the American people in the first election after it was incorporated into law. It did not have a sponsor in an open discussion in this country. Its friends were few and far between. It placed a tariff of 11 cents a pound on wool, and yet in this bill you propose 15 cents, and put a joker in it that on the wool which comes from New Zealand and Australia there will be imposed on the raw article 30 cents a pound.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator have in mind that President Taft said that Schedule K, the wool schedule, was indefensible?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; and no greater truth was ever uttered by the distinguished ex-President. Yet the Republican majority in the Senate not only ask Republican Senators to line up and vote for a bill which carries such a high and exorbitant tariff rate as 30 cents a pound on raw wool, nearly three times as much as was provided in the Payne-Andrich tariff law, but they come to this side of the Chamber and appeal for votes of Democrats to help them place this legislation upon the statute books.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], for whom I have great respect, and who is the only Senator on the other side of the aisle who has been faithful to this measure when others have deserted him, has sat in his seat many times the only Republican Senator in the Chamber during this debate. He has been faithful and courageous in his action. He placed in the Record the other day the names of distinguished Southerners who belong to that tariff association which met a few days ago at Atlanta, and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] placed in the Record some resolutions which indorsed the so-called emergency tariff legislation, and I took umbrage and offense at the suggestion that certain governors of the South were vice presidents of that tariff association. I said then, and I say now, that I can not believe, because I know some of those governors, that they knew what that association was doing and for what purpose it was organized or they would never have allowed their names to be used. I am quite sure that the governor of my State would not, because I believe he is a Democrat on the tariff question and would not stand for such a bill as this; and I believe the same thing can be said of the other governors who are vice presidents of that association.

I got a telegram from the president of that so-called association, and I am going to have it incorporated in the Record. I have not answered it. I did not think it was necessary for me to answer it, because I can not believe that that convention

knew what is in this bill. I do not know who composed that convention, but I know that it did not express the sentiment of the South on the question of the tariff. I know that no member of that convention from my State expressed the sentiment of the people of Mississippi when they sent me that telegram indorsing this emergency tariff legislation.

I do know the president of the organization, John H. Kirby, a distinguished citizen of Texas, a man whom I like very much and respect a great deal, but whose views on the tariff I have never respected, particularly as a Democrat, because he has differed always on that great question from the views I have entertained. He is the president of the association, and sent me a telegram which reads as follows:

ATLANTA, GA., January 27, 1921.

HON. PAT HARRISON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Southern Tariff Congress in session here, representing all Southern States and industries, believes that the prompt adoption of the emergency tariff bill, with the Senate amendments, will be of very great advantage to southern agriculture and industry. The convention has approved this measure by unanimous vote, and directs me, as president of the congress, to request your support of the measure.

JOHN H. KIRBY, President.

It was suggested in a telegram put in the Record by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] that Gov. John M. Parker was one of the presiding officers of that convention. Gov. Parker is one of the best executives in the United States. He is a man of high character and splendid ability. He was born and raised in my State. But every Louisianan, and every one who knows his record and his political beliefs, knows that Gov. Parker has always been a protectionist on the tariff question. So I care nothing about this message or the resolutions that have been passed there. I know that this bill is wrong in principle. I know that it will mean the placing of a great burden on American consumers and I am opposed to it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator to explain how the delegates to that convention got authority from the people of the South to express their views on the tariff question?

Mr. HARRISON. I can not. I do not know who promoted this organization. I do not think I ever heard of it until just a few weeks ago. I do not know who the delegates were. I saw the name of ex-Senator McLaurin, of South Carolina, mentioned; Gov. Parker's name was mentioned; and John H. Kirby's name was mentioned. Then I heard the list of distinguished governors of States in the South who are vice presidents of it. I do not know that a single one of those men attended that convention except Gov. Parker.

I do not care to delay the Senate any longer, although I wanted to speak on several other phases of this important question. I wanted to take up the question of our foreign trade and show that the thing we need to-day for the farmer is markets in foreign countries. I wanted to discuss the question of retaliation upon the part of South American countries and Canada in the event we should pass this legislation, passing it at a time, may I say, when we have spent millions on millions of dollars sending our commercial attaches and consular and commercial agents to South American countries and abroad trying to build up a trade in those countries, by legislative enactment amending the Federal reserve law so that our banks can go into foreign countries and establish banks that our trade might be enlarged, that the great manufacturing interests of Pennsylvania, of Massachusetts, and of the South, and all sections might find a market wherein their products might be sold, and I know that the passage of this legislation will be resented in those countries in which we have been trying to obtain trade and with which now we are on the friendliest relations.

I wish I had time to read resolutions passed by the chambers of commerce in Argentina, resolutions which have been passed in mass meetings there resenting the action of the United States Congress in placing an embargo against them, closing our markets to them, and at the same time asking of them that we be allowed to send our products and our foodstuffs there for sale.

I wish I could go through the resolutions I have, passed by the chambers of commerce in Canada, asking us not to close the doors against them, because they say they have extended to us a warm welcome in their own markets, which we have taken advantage of.

To pass this kind of legislation will be the forerunner of a retarding of our growing export trade, which has mounted so high for the past few years that now it is \$3,000,000,000 more than our imports.

I wish I had the time to discuss the indemnity that has now been placed on Germany and the 12½ per cent export tariff that has been charged on the products which are exported from

Germany to the United States, giving to us that much protection.

I am sure the American people will understand what you are driving at. And they will understand the position we have taken here, trying to make you live up to your campaign promises, and trying to defeat this iniquitous bill that will add to the burdens of the great number of unemployed in this country, of the great numbers whose wages have been decreased in the last few months, and will increase the burden of the consumers of the country.

So to-morrow I shall vote against the cloture, and I can not for the life of me see how anyone on this side of the aisle, when the question of a cloture is voted on, can follow the leadership of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

The American people will never be able to differentiate between a vote for the cloture, which would restrict a free discussion of every provision of this bill, and a vote afterwards against the bill. Let the issue be drawn. If you have your two-thirds vote to pass this piece of legislation, then go to it. But I do not think you have them, and I do not believe you are very hopeful that you have them. Furthermore, I do not believe that you really want them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. Before the Senate adjourns I want to offer some amendments to the bill. Was the Senator about to make a motion to adjourn?

Mr. McCUMBER. In a very short time. I wish first to make a statement.

Mr. President, more than two-thirds of the Senate of the United States, if they could vote this minute upon the pending measure, would vote, in my belief, in favor of it. This is a country ruled by majorities. I have every reason to believe that the majority of the Senate, consisting of Senators on both sides of the Chamber, are just as honest, just as conscientious, just as intelligent, as the less than one-third of the Senate, and as much as I dislike a cloture rule, I dislike to a greater extent the exercise of the power of one-third of the Senate in strangling the voice and the expression of the other two-thirds. Whenever it comes to the position where less than one-third of the Members of the United States Senate set about to defeat a measure that is supported by more than two-thirds, I am ready to stand for the cloture rule.

Many of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber say that they want time to discuss the bill. Time will be given. If the Senators do not want a cloture, let them agree upon some time at which we can vote. They do not intend to do anything of the kind. They do not intend to allow us to secure a vote upon the measure if they can talk it to death. I intend to do everything in my power to reach a vote, and I have therefore supported the cloture rule. I know that there are Senators on the other side who are opposed to the bill, and yet who are not opposed to fixing a day, a reasonable length ahead, in order to secure that vote. But, unhappily, those Senators have not sufficient influence over those who would forestall any action upon the measure whatsoever. If Senators wish to escape the cloture rule, if they think it is wrong and if they are honest in their convictions and in their statements that they want a vote at some time during the present session, they will have no difficulty in arriving at an agreement with this side of the Chamber with reference to a time when the vote may be had.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] suggested that there would be no use of opposing the measure; that even if we succeeded in passing it, it was a foregone conclusion that the President of the United States would veto it; and that we would not have the two-thirds majority to pass it over his veto. I do not claim to know what is in the mind of the President of the United States. I know nothing either of his physical or his mental condition. I do not know whether he would veto the bill or not. My own belief is that he would not veto it. But suppose he would—suppose I were convinced that he would veto it—would that vary my duty in the premises?

It is the function of this body to determine what legislation it sees fit to present to the President, and his function to either approve or disapprove it. I should not be influenced in the slightest degree if I believed, as I do, that this measure is for the benefit of the American people, to deviate from my course in attempting to press it to a vote because I might think that the President of the United States would veto it.

Again, the Senator from Michigan suggests that the bill will be so loaded down with amendments that it will become a general tariff bill. I do not think the Senator is correct. When anyone wants to kill a bill, of course, he will offer all kinds of

amendments, and just as many as he can. Undoubtedly those who wish to prevent the bill from becoming a law will attempt to load it with as many amendments as they possibly can; but we have this protection against it, the vote of the Senate, and that will be sufficient to vote down any amendment that is considered unimportant. This started out as a measure for the benefit of the agricultural class in the United States. I propose, so far as my vote is concerned, to limit it to that purpose by voting against every amendment that would extend the measure beyond that purpose.

I can not agree with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. He talks very learnedly and very earnestly in favor of what he calls the consumer and the wage earner. I have heard the term "wage earner" used often in this debate. Is not the farmer a wage earner? Are not the farmers, comprising 33,000,000 of the population, entitled to as much consideration as any other wage earners? Is it not God's truth that the farmer is not getting one-quarter of the remuneration for his labor that any other labor in the city is receiving to-day? Why should we not consider his interest a little while? I know that he has been ground down to the earth so long and we have purchased his products so cheaply for such a length of time that we have begun to consider that he has no purpose in our industrial life except for the mere privilege of existing, to produce food for the rest of the people to eat. I refuse to accept that position for the farmer of the United States. So long as I am in this Chamber my vote and my voice will always be in favor of any measure which I honestly believe will bring his earning capacity up nearer to the equal of the earning capacity of the rest of the population of the United States, so that he may be able to spend as much upon his wife and daughters and sons as do the people in the great cities, so that he may have some of the comforts, aye, some of the luxuries of life, as well as those who live in the cities.

I know that the provisions of the pending bill will increase the price of these products if it is going to be any benefit to us, but the man who is earning \$3 a day can afford to pay a little better price than the man who labors all day for 50 cents. I think our first consideration should be for the man who is receiving but little compensation for his labor. I know how the people in my State are suffering. I know how the banks are going to the wall; and while the wage earner in the city, about whom the Senator from Mississippi speaks, is talking over with his wife how he can make two ends meet with his wages and the expenses, the farmer in my State is to-day talking over with the mortgagee how on earth he can save his farm, the only means that he has of livelihood. Give him a show in the world equal to the others and consider his interest as you would consider the interest of the others.

The Senator from Mississippi stated that he is getting tired of discussing the sugar matter. Ah, Mr. President, I am getting tired of an argument on the other side of the Chamber which first declares that we will not increase the price of wheat one cent to the farmer and then, before the Senator gets two sentences away from that declaration, he begins to figure up how much more it is going to cost the people of Massachusetts and other places for the flour that they will have to buy made from the wheat that is increased 40 or 50 cents a bushel by this bill. Either drop one of the arguments or the other, because the two are absolutely inconsistent with each other.

Mr. President, I believe the bill will help the farmer; I believe it will raise the price of wheat; and I believe that the consumer will pay \$1.60 to \$1.80, perhaps more, per barrel for his flour. Certainly he will, but if he earns five times as much as the farmer who produces that barrel of flour he can afford to pay that much extra. If we can increase the earning capacity of the farmer so he can buy more of the clothes and other things that the city labor produces, he will be better off, because he can continue in his work.

I note what the Senator from Mississippi says about the governors. I think the Senator from Mississippi gives scant credit to the intelligence of those several governors of the South when he declares that they did not know that their names were upon the roll as vice presidents of an association which stands for protection and tariff protection. If some company or association, declaring itself to be the free trade association of the United States, would ask me to become a vice president, I think I would know enough to keep out of it if I did not believe in it.

I think the Senator gave scant credit to the resolution of this great association that met the other day at Atlanta when he said that probably not one of them had ever read the bill and that they passed the resolution without knowing the slightest thing of what was contained in the bill concerning which they were making their resolves.

If it comes to a question between appropriation bills and the pending measure, I shall favor allowing the appropriation bills to go over, but I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that the best way out of the dilemma is to force the cloture, and then we shall get a vote in three days at least, in my opinion, and when we get the vote the field will be clear for the appropriation bills. If we do not force the cloture, of course, we shall have to fight each for his own bill before the Senate, and it may endanger the passage of a good many appropriation bills.

To my mind, the emergency tariff bill can not wait; it will be 10 months before we shall be able to get through both branches of Congress a general tariff bill. We could put through every one of the appropriation bills at the next session before the 1st of July if we were compelled to do so. I hope we will not be compelled to do so, but if we will work together, and if those Senators who want to vote for the bill but have scruples against the voting for cloture will in this situation join us and vote for cloture, we will have, in my opinion, both the appropriation bills and the pending bill off the calendar before the end of the present session.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I submit three amendments intended to be proposed by me to the emergency tariff bill now pending, and I ask that they be read so that they may be in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendments intended to be proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Paragraph 18, page 4, line 5, after the words "per pound," insert the following: "Provided, That skirted wools as imported in 1890 and prior thereto are hereby exempted."

Paragraph 18, page 3, line 16, strike out the words "wool, commonly known as clothing wool," and in place thereof insert the words "all wools."

On page 4, strike out all after the words "scoured condition," line 8, and insert the following: "and put through any or all of those processes of manufacture necessary to the production of tops and not through any subsequent processes, 50 cents per pound; advanced through any or all of those processes necessary for the production of yarns but not through any subsequent processes, 52½ cents per pound; advanced beyond yarns through any or all of the processes necessary for the production of cloth, woven fabrics, or knitted fabrics, 60 cents per pound."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will lie on the table.

Mr. SIMMONS obtained the floor.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him for a moment, I was about to make a motion either for a recess or an adjournment, but I will not make it until the Senator from North Carolina has had an opportunity to address the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to occupy only a moment, Mr. President. The Senator from North Dakota, pointing his finger at the membership on this side of the aisle, has made the declaration that the minority of this body desired to prevent a vote upon the pending bill. I wish to say that while there may be several Members on this side of the Chamber who do not desire to vote upon the bill, the charge which the Senator makes against this side as a whole is not warranted by the facts or by anything that has transpired during the course of the debate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I specifically stated that it was not a charge as to the whole Democratic side; I stated that only a few Senators desired to prevent a vote on the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator to say that this side of the Chamber was attempting to defeat a vote upon the pending measure, and I think that is what the Senator did say.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will allow me again, seeing the Senator from North Carolina in his seat and knowing that he was perfectly willing to agree upon a day to vote upon this bill, as he had previously stated, I specifically said that there were a few Senators on the other side of the Chamber who were determined not to allow this measure to come to a vote, and that those who were willing to have a time fixed, I feared, would not have control over those few and be able to get them to agree upon a time for a vote.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am glad the Senator has qualified his statement, as I understood it, or, if I was in error, I am glad that he has corrected me; but I wish to say to the Senator before he shakes his gory locks at this side of the Chamber with reference to their attitude as to a vote on the pending bill—

Mr. McCUMBER. May I suggest to the Senator that my locks are not gory, although they are a little inclined to be red. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will—and I advise him to do so—take a confidential poll of his side of the Chamber, with

a view to ascertaining how many of his colleagues on his side of the Chamber desire to prevent a vote upon this bill, I think a situation will be disclosed which will be rather startling to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to say that I have taken a poll, and I do not think there is a single Senator in the category referred to by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then it was not a confidential poll.

Mr. McNARY. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the pending emergency tariff bill and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

On page 2, at the end of line 10, insert the following: "cherries in barrel brine, 5 cents per pound."

On page 4, at the end of line 9, insert the following: "walnuts and filberts, 5 cents per pound."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I present an amendment which I desire at the proper time to offer to the pending bill. I may say that unanimous consent was granted a while ago, before the present occupant of the chair was in the chair, that proposed amendments need not be read, but could be presented and stated by caption, as I understood.

Mr. PENROSE. Let them be printed. I now move that the Senate take a recess—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Chair is not going to be bound by unanimous consent against the rule of the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. The unanimous-consent agreement to which I have referred does not apply, of course, to the amendment that I am now offering, but there were some amendments proposed as to which such an agreement was made.

Mr. SMOOT. Was that agreement reached this afternoon?

Mr. HARRISON. It was made this afternoon.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say that I have been out of the Chamber in attendance upon the Committee on Appropriations and so could not be here, but if I had been here I would have objected to such an agreement, because it is contrary to the position taken by the Vice President in his ruling this morning.

Mr. PENROSE. It was so agreed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think the Senator from Utah need worry; I think he will have plenty of chance to offer his amendments. I am sure of that.

Mr. SMOOT. I think so, too.

Mr. McCUMBER. Without going into an argument on this question, I think it fair to say that the amendment which was offered, and which it was agreed need not be read, was the immigration bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. The unanimous consent for which I asked was that the reading of the caption might, by unanimous consent, be considered as fulfilling the requirements of the rule for a full reading of an amendment before it could be presented to be voted upon. There was no objection to that.

Now, I wish to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he will not, instead of moving that the Senate take a recess, consent to move that the Senate adjourn. I understand that we shall vote upon the adoption of the cloture rule at 1 o'clock to-morrow, which will give time in the forenoon for those Senators who desire to offer any amendments which they may not have offered up to the present time to present them and have them read. I do not want any Senator to feel that he has not had an opportunity to present amendments which he may desire to offer, even if we should vote for cloture, so that they could be voted upon.

Mr. HARRISON. As to the amendment which I have presented, let it lie over and be read to-morrow in order that the rule may be complied with; and the same action may be taken with reference to the immigration amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well, if there shall be any question about it; but I do not think there will be.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HARRISON is as follows:

In line 25, page 3, strike out the word "On" after the period following the word "wool," and also strike out lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on page 4.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 2, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 1, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and obviously there is none.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Focht	Lufkin	Riordan
Ayres	Fordney	Luhning	Robinson, N. C.
Babka	Frear	McAndrews	Rowan
Beer	Gandy	McCulloch	Rowe
Blackmon	Ganly	McFadden	Rucker
Bland, Mo.	Goldfogle	McGlennon	Sabath
Bowers	Good	McKinley	Sanders, Ind.
Brinson	Goodall	McLane	Sanders, La.
Britten	Goodwin, Ark.	MacGregor	Sanford
Brooks, Pa.	Goodykoontz	Magee	Scully
Brumbaugh	Gould	Maher	Sells
Butler	Graham, Ill.	Mann, S. C.	Smithwick
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Steenerson
Candler	Hamill	Milligan	Stiness
Cantrill	Hamilton	Moon	Strong, Pa.
Carew	Harrison	Mooney	Sullivan
Carrs	Haugen	Moore, Va.	Tague
Casey	Hays	Moore, Ind.	Tinkham
Clark, Fla.	Hudspeth	Morin	Upshaw
Classon	Ireland	Mudd	Vare
Copley	James, Mich.	Murphy	Venable
Costello	Jeffers	Nelson, Wis.	Walters
Crowther	Johnston, N. Y.	Nolan	Watkins
Currie, Mich.	Kennedy, Iowa	Olney	Weaver
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy, R. I.	Padgett	Whaley
Dent	Kettner	Pell	White, Me.
Donovan	Kitchin	Periman	Williams
Dooling	Kreider	Raney, Ala.	Wilson, Pa.
Egan	Lampert	Ransley	Wise
Ellsworth	Langley	Reavis	Woods, Va.
Emerson	Lehibach	Reed, W. Va.	
Ferris	Loneragan	Riddick	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Rev. George L. Mackintosh, D. D., president of Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all the generations. We thank Thee for those who have gone before us in the way of human progress and enlightenment, for the prophets and the statesmen and the sages and the heroes. We pray that we may be enlightened and strengthened by their words and their example to high thoughts and true and noble endeavor. In this day of world debate and uncertainty, we pray Thy blessing upon all those who have in their hands temporarily the destinies of nations and the world. Bless the President of the United States and the Vice President and the coming President of the United States and the Vice President and all Members of our Houses of Congress, that they may be so inspired and so enlightened that they may put the good of the country, its prosperity, and its perpetuity before all private considerations whatsoever. We pray for our beloved country, that there may be peace and prosperity and happiness here, and happy and peaceful relations with all the countries of the world. We especially pray Thy blessing and guidance upon the business of the day, and that out of its deliberations may come some way of righteousness and truth and honor for us all and for our beloved country. We ask in the name of the great Master and Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. SNELL. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on what subject does the gentleman wish to address the House?

Mr. SNELL. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. If the gentleman wants to object, he can.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The unfinished business is the river and harbor bill, and there was pending a motion of the gentleman from North Carolina to recommit the bill with instructions, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMALL moves to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following—

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BEE. Is it necessary for the Clerk, under the rules, to read that entire substitute?

The SPEAKER. It is, unless it is omitted by unanimous consent.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading may be dispensed with. Everybody has a copy before him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I did not object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums of money be, and are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, for the construction, completion, repair, and preservation of the public works hereinafter named:

Newburyport Harbor, Mass.: For maintenance, \$2,000.
 Boston Harbor, Mass.: For maintenance, \$40,000.
 Pollock Rip Shoals, harbor of refuge at Nantucket, New Bedford, and Fairhaven Harbors, Fall River Harbor, and Taunton River, Mass.: For maintenance, \$25,000; continuing improvement and for maintenance of Pollock Rip Channel, \$150,000; in all, \$185,000.
 Stonington and New London Harbors, Conn.: Pawcatuck River, R. I. and Conn.; and Mystic and Thames Rivers, Conn.: For maintenance, \$5,000.
 Connecticut River above and below Hartford, Conn.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance below Hartford, \$65,000.
 Duck Island, Branford, New Haven, Milford, Bridgeport, Southport, Norwalk, Five Mile River, Stamford, and Greenwich Harbors, Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, breakwaters at New Haven, and Housatonic River, Conn.: For maintenance, \$105,000; continuing improvement of Stamford Harbor, \$100,000; in all, \$205,000.
 New York Harbor, N. Y.: For maintenance of entrance channels and for continuing improvement of Ambrose Channel, Craven Shoal Channel, and Anchorage Channel, \$550,000.
 Channel in Gowanus Bay, N. Y.: Continuing improvement of Red Hook Channel, \$150,000.
 East River, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$3,000,000.
 Newtown Creek, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$100,000.
 Hudson River Channel, New York Harbor, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, \$750,000.
 Burlington Harbor, Vt.; Plattsburg and Fort Henry Harbors, N. Y.; and Narrows of Lake Champlain, N. Y. and Vt.: For maintenance, \$20,000.
 Newark Bay and Passaic River, N. J.: For maintenance, \$10,000.
 Keyport and Shoal Harbors, Woodbridge, Chesapeake, Matawan, and Compton Creeks, Elizabeth, Raritan, South, and Shrewsbury Rivers, and Raritan Bay, N. J.: For maintenance, \$32,500; continuing improvement of Raritan River, \$25,000; in all, \$57,500.
 Delaware River, between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J.: For maintenance, \$12,500.
 Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.: For maintenance from Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, to the sea, \$2,000,000.
 Cooper, Salem, Cohamsey, and Maurice Rivers, Woodbury, Mantua, Raccoon, Oldmans, and Alloway Creeks, N. J.: For maintenance, \$20,000.
 Cold Spring and Absecon Inlets, Absecon and Tuckerton Creeks, and Toms River, N. J.: For maintenance, \$9,200; *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended on Absecon Inlet.
 Wilmington Harbor, Del.: For maintenance, \$60,000.
 Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.: Continuing improvement, \$1,000,000.
 Appoquinimink, Smyrna, Leipsic, Little, St. Jones, Murderkill, Mispillon, and Broadkill Rivers, Del.: For maintenance, \$25,000.
 Waterway from Chincoteague Bay, Va., to Delaware Bay at or near Lewes, Del.: For maintenance, \$1,500.
 Waterway on the coast of Virginia: For maintenance, \$2,000.
 Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$125,000.
 Rockhall, Queenstown, Claiborne, Tilghman Island, Cambridge, and Crisfield Harbors, Elk and Little Elk, Chester, Corsica, Choptank, Tuckahoe, Warwick, La Trappe, Tred Aron, Wicomico, and Pocomoke Rivers, Slaughter, Tyaskin, and Broad Creeks, Twitch Cove and Big Thoroughfare River, and Lower Thoroughfare, Deal Island, Md.; Nanticoke River (including Northwest Fork), Del. and Md.; Broad Creek River, Del.; and Tangier Channel, Va.: For maintenance, \$20,000.
 Potomac River, at Washington, D. C., at Alexandria, Va., and at Lower Cedar Point, Md.; Occoquan and Aquia Creeks, Va.: For maintenance, \$20,000.
 Rappahannock, Mattaponi, and Pamunkey Rivers, and Urbana Creek, Va.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

James, Nansemond, Pagan, and Appomattox Rivers, Va.: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Va.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, including channel to Newport News, \$700,000.

Onancock River, Va.: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Mantee Bay, Scuppernon, Pamlico, Tar, South, Bay, Neuse, and Trent Rivers, Fishing, Contentnea, Swift, and Smiths Creeks, and waterway connecting Swan Quarter Bay with Deep Bay, N. C.: For maintenance, \$25,000.

Beaufort and Morehead City Harbors, Beaufort Inlet, waterway from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Inlet, waterway connecting Core Sound and Beaufort Harbor, channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay and Cedar Bay, and inland waterway Beaufort to Jacksonville, N. C.: For maintenance, \$2,500.

Northeast, Black, and Cape Fear Rivers, N. C.: For maintenance, \$100,000.

Winyah Bay, Waccamaw, Little Pee Dee, and Great Pee Dee Rivers, S. C.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Santee and Congaree Rivers, S. C.: For maintenance, including the Estherville-Minim Creek Canal and the Congaree River as far up as the Gervais Street Bridge, Columbia, \$5,000.

Waterway between Charleston and Winyah Bay, S. C.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$15,500.

Charleston Harbor and Channels, S. C.: Continuing improvement to provide a channel 40 feet deep and 1,000 feet wide, extending from the sea to the Charleston Navy Yard, \$500,000.

Wappoo Cut, S. C.: For maintenance, \$4,000.

Savannah Harbor and Savannah River, below, at, and above Augusta, Ga.: For maintenance, \$366,000; continuing improvement of Savannah Harbor, \$300,000; in all, \$666,000.

Waterway between Beaufort, S. C., and St. Johns River, Fla.: For maintenance, \$40,000.

Sapelo and Darien Harbors, Cowhead and Satilla Rivers, and Fancy Bluff Creeks, Ga., and St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla.: For maintenance, \$20,000.

Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$40,000.

Brunswick Harbor, Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$100,000.

St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean, Jacksonville to Palatka, and Palatka to Lake Harney, Lake Crescent, and Dunns Creek, and Oklawaha River, Fla.: For maintenance, \$422,000.

Indian River, St. Lucie Inlet, Miami Harbor (Biscayne Bay), and harbor at Key West, Fla.: For maintenance, \$60,500.

Kissimmee, Caloosahatchee, Orange, Anclote, Crystal, Withlacoochee, and Suwannee Rivers, Charlotte Harbor, Sarasota Bay, and Clearwater Harbor and Boca Ciega Bay, Fla.: For maintenance, \$13,500.

Tampa and Hillsboro Bays, St. Petersburg Harbor, Hillsboro and Manatee Rivers, Fla.: Continuing improvement of Hillsboro Bay, \$300,000.

Carrabelle Bar and Harbor, Apalachicola, St. Joseph and St. Andrews Bays, Apalachicola and Chipola Rivers, and channel from Apalachicola River to St. Andrews Bay, Fla.: Flint River, Ga.: and Chattahoochee River, Ga. and Ala.: For maintenance, including the cut-off, Lee Slough, lower Chipola River, and upper Chipola River from Marianna to its mouth, \$126,500; completing improvement of Flint River, \$10,000; in all, \$136,500.

Holmes and Blackwater Rivers, Fla.: Choctawhatchee, Escambia, and Conecuh Rivers, Fla. and Ala.: the narrows in Santa Rosa Sound, and Pensacola Harbor, Fla.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Alabama River, Ala., and Coosa River, Ala. and Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance of the Alabama River, including the Alabama and Coosa Rivers between Montgomery and Wetumpka, \$42,000.

Mobile Harbor and Bar, and channel connecting Mobile Bay and Mississippi Sound, Ala.: For maintenance of channel connecting Mobile Bay and Mississippi Sound, \$10,000; continuing improvement and for maintenance of Mobile Harbor and Bar, \$316,000; in all, \$326,000.

Gulfport Harbor, Miss.: For maintenance of anchorage basin at Gulfport and channel therefrom to the anchorage or roadstead at Ship Island, and for maintenance of channel at Ship Island Pass, \$100,000.

Pascagoula, Wolf, Jordan, Pearl, and East Pearl Rivers, and Biloxi Harbor, Miss.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Passes at the mouth of the Mississippi River: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$2,000,000.

Lake Pontchartrain, Pass Manchac, Bogue Falls, Chefuncte, Ponchartroula, Natalbany, Blood, Tickfaw, and Amite Rivers, and Bayou Manchac, La.: For maintenance, \$9,700.

Barataria Bay and Bayous Lafourche, Terrebonne, Grossetete, Plaquemine, and Teche, La.: For maintenance, including Grand River and Pigeon Bayou, \$20,000; continuing improvement of Bayou Teche, \$50,000; in all, \$70,000.

Atchafalaya River, La.: For maintenance, \$30,000.

Waterway, from the Mississippi River to the Sabine River, La.: For improvement from Mississippi River to Bayou Teche, \$50,000; continuing improvement from Franklin to Mermentau, \$200,000; continuing improvement from Mermentau River to Sabine River, \$168,000; in all, \$418,000.

Bayous Vermilion, Nezperque, des Cannes, Plaquemine Brule, and Quebe de Tortue, Mermentau River, and Calcasieu River and Pass, La.: For maintenance, including channel, bay, and passes of Bayou Vermilion, and tributaries of Mermentau River, \$15,000.

Removing the water hyacinths, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas: For the removal of the water hyacinth from the navigable waters in the States named in so far as it is or may become an obstruction to navigation, \$17,500.

Galveston Harbor, Galveston Channel, Port Bolivar Channel, Texas City Channel, and Houston Ship Channel, Tex.: For maintenance, \$705,000; continuing improvement by construction of sea-wall extension to protect Galveston Channel, \$100,000.

Anahuac Channel, mouth of Trinity River, Oyster and Clear Creeks, and Cedar, Chocolate, Turtle, Bastrop, Dickinson, Double, and East Bay Bayous, Tex.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Waterway from Galveston to Corpus Christi and channel from Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Freeport Harbor, Tex.: Continuing improvement, \$160,000.

Port Aransas, Tex.: For maintenance, \$150,000.

Harbor at Sabine Pass and Port Arthur Canal, Sabine-Neches Canal, and Johnsons Bayou, La. and Tex.: For maintenance, \$217,000.

Red, Black, Ouachita, Tensas, Boeuf, and Saline Rivers, and Bayous Macon, Bartholomew, D'Arbonne, and Corney, Ark. and La.: For maintenance, \$55,000, continuing improvement of Ouachita River in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 7, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, \$175,000; in all, \$230,000.

Yazoo River and tributaries, Mississippi: For maintenance, including Yazoo, Tallahatchie, Coldwater, and Big Sunflower Rivers, Tchula Lake, Steele and Washington Bayous, Lake Washington, and Bear Creek, \$25,000.

Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.: For maintenance, \$20,000.

Black and Current Rivers, Ark. and Mo.; and White, St. Francis, and L'Anguille Rivers, and Blackfish Bayou, Ark.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to and including the mouth of the Missouri River: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$500,000.

Mississippi River: For the removal of snags and wrecks from the Mississippi River below the mouth of the Missouri River, and from Old and Atchafalaya Rivers, in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in his annual report for 1920, \$25,000, in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated.

Mississippi River from the mouth of the Missouri River to Minneapolis, Minn.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$1,070,000.

St. Croix River, Wis. and Minn.; Minnesota River, Minn.; Lake Traverse, Minn. and S. Dak.; and Red River of the North, Minn. and N. Dak.: For maintenance, \$2,500.

Missouri River: For maintenance between Kansas City, Kans., from the upper end of Quindaro Bend, and the mouth of the river, \$225,000.

Ozage and Gasconade Rivers, Mo., and Kansas River, Kans.: For maintenance, \$10,000.

Cumberland River, Tenn. and Ky.: For maintenance above Nashville, \$5,000; continuing improvement below Nashville, \$150,000; in all, \$155,000.

Tennessee River, Tenn., Ala., and Ky.: For maintenance and continuing improvement, \$503,000.

Ohio River: Continuing improvement and for maintenance by open-channel work, \$300,000.

Ohio River: Continuing improvement by the construction of locks and dams with a view to securing a navigable depth of 9 feet, \$2,500,000.

Allegheny River, Pa.: For maintenance by open-channel work, \$10,000; continuing improvement by construction of locks and dams, \$250,000; in all, \$260,000.

Pittsburgh Harbor, Pa.: For maintenance, \$6,000.

Grand Marais, Marquette Bay, and Ontonagon Harbors, and Keweenaw Waterway, Mich.: Ashland and Port Wing Harbors, Wis.: Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.: Agate Bay and Grand Marais Harbors, Minn.: For maintenance, \$190,000; continuing improvements of Keweenaw Waterway, \$10,000; in all, \$200,000.

Warroad Harbor and River, Baudette Harbor and River, Zippel Bay, and Lake of the Woods, Minn.: For maintenance, \$3,800.

Manistique Harbor, Mich.: Menominee, Oconto, Green Bay, Algoma, Keweenaw, Two Rivers, Manitowoc, Sheboygan, Port Washington, Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha, and Waukegan Harbors, Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, and Fox River, Wis.: For maintenance, \$300,000; completing improvement of Racine Harbor, \$165,000; in all, \$465,000.

St. Joseph Harbor and River, Saugetuck Harbor and Kalamazoo River, South Haven, Holland, Grand Haven, Muskegon, White Lake, Pentwater, Ludington, Manistee, Portage Lake, Arcadia, Frankfort, Charlevoix, and Petoskey Harbors, and Grand River, Mich.: For maintenance, \$350,000; completing improvement of Ludington Harbor, \$55,000; in all, \$405,000.

Chicago and Calumet Harbors, Chicago and Illinois Rivers, Ill.: Calumet River, Ill. and Ind.: and Indiana and Michigan City Harbors, Ind.: For maintenance, \$390,000; continuing improvement of Calumet River, \$160,000; continuing improvement of Illinois River below Copperas Creek, \$46,000; continuing improvement of Indiana Harbor, \$200,000; in all, \$796,000.

Ship channel connecting waters of the Great Lakes between Chicago, Duluth, and Buffalo, including St. Marys River, St. Clair River, channels in Lake St. Clair and Detroit River, Mich.: For maintenance, \$119,000; continuing improvement of Livingstone Channel, Detroit River, \$750,000; in all, \$869,000.

The unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of the fourth lock in St. Marys River, Mich., is hereby made available for maintenance work in said St. Marys River.

MacInnac, Cheboygan, Rogers City, Alpena, Harbor Beach, and Monroe Harbors, Saginaw, Black, Clinton, and Rogue Rivers, Mich.: For maintenance, \$60,000; continuing improvement of Rogue River, \$75,000; in all, \$135,000.

Toledo, Port Clinton, Sandusky, Huron, Vermilion, Lorain, Cleveland, Fairport, Ashabula, and Conneaut Harbors, Ohio: For maintenance, \$89,000.

erie Harbor, Pa.: Dunkirk and Buffalo Harbors, Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, and Niagara River, N. Y.: For maintenance, \$341,000; completing improvement of Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, \$170,000; in all, \$511,000.

Olcott, Charlotte, Greatodus Bay, Littleodus Bay, Oswego, Cape Vincent, and Ogdensburg Harbors, N. Y.: For maintenance, \$49,000; completing improvement of Oswego Harbor, \$50,000; in all, \$99,000.

San Francisco, Oakland, Richmond, Monterey, Humboldt, and Crescent City Harbors, Redwood, Petaluma, and San Rafael Creeks, Napa River, San Pablo Bay, and Suisun and Suisun Bay Channels, Calif.: For maintenance, \$145,000; continuing improvement of Richmond Harbor, \$160,000; completing improvement of Petaluma Creek, \$50,300; continuing improvement of Humboldt Harbor and Bay, \$250,000; for improvement of Crescent City Harbor in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 434, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$100,000; in all, \$705,300.

Sacramento, Feather, San Joaquin, and Mokelumne Rivers, and Stockton and Mormon Channels (diverting canal), Calif.: For maintenance, \$121,800.

Cocouille, Coos, Siuslaw, and Yaquina Rivers, and Coos, Yaquina, Tillamook, and Nehalem Bays, Ore.: For maintenance, \$151,000; continuing improvement of Yaquina Bay and Harbor, \$175,000; in all, \$326,000.

Casades and Dalles-Cello Canals, Ore.: Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to the mouth of Snake River, Ore. and Wash., and Snake River, Ore., Wash., and Idaho: For maintenance, \$5,000.

Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., and mouth of Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$500,000.

Willamette River above Portland and at Willamette Falls, Yamhill and Clatskanie Rivers, Oreg.; Cowlitz, Lewis, and Grays Rivers, and Skamokawa Creek, Wash.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Willapa River and Harbor, Grays Harbor, Chehalis and Hoquiam Rivers, Wash.: Continuing improvement of Willapa River and Harbor, \$52,050.

Puget Sound and its tributary waters, Olympia, Seattle, Anacortes, Port Gamble, Tacoma, and Bellingham Harbors, Lake Washington Ship Canal, Snohomish and Skagit Rivers, Swinomish Slough, waterway connecting Port Townsend Bay and Oak Bay, Columbia River between Wenatchee and Kettle Falls, Wash.: For maintenance, \$25,000; continuing improvement of Lake Washington Ship Canal, \$65,000; in all, \$90,000.

Nome Harbor, Alaska: Continuing improvement and for maintenance of Nome Harbor, \$20,000.

San Juan Harbor, Porto Rico: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$400,000.

For examinations, surveys, and contingencies for rivers and harbors for which there may be no special appropriation, \$250,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit, for the reason that there is a provision in the motion making the funds immediately available, which is unauthorized by law, and it is new legislation on an appropriation bill. That clause will be found in the early part of the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. SMALL and Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 121, nays 205, answered "present" 1, not voting 102, as follows:

YEAS—121.

Almon	Dupré	Lazaro	Rodenberg
Aswell	Eagle	Lea, Calif.	Romjue
Bankhead	Evans, Mont.	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Barkley	Fields	Leshner	Rubey
Bell	Fisher	Linthicum	Sears
Benson	Flood	Luhning	Sherwood
Bland, Va.	Gard	McDuffie	Sims
Bowling	Garrett	Major	Sinclair
Box	Godwin, N. C.	Mansfield	Small
Brand	Griffin	Martin	Smith, N. Y.
Briggs	Hardy, Tex.	Mason	Smithwick
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hayden	Mays	Steagall
Caldwell	Hoey	Minahan, N. J.	Stedman
Cantrill	Holland	Monahan, Wis.	Steele
Caraway	Howard	Montague	Stephens, Ohio
Clark, Mo.	Huddleston	Moore, Va.	Stoll
Cleary	Hudspeth	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Coady	Hull, Iowa	O'Connell	Thomas
Collier	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connor	Tillman
Cullen	Humphreys	Ogden	Venable
Curry, Calif.	Igoe	Oldfield	Vinson
Davey	Jacoway	Oliver	Welty
Davis, Tenn.	James, Va.	Overstreet	Wilson, La.
Denison	Johnson, Ky.	Padgett	Wilson, Pa.
Dewalt	Johnson, Miss.	Park	Wingo
Dickinson, Mo.	Keller	Pou	Woods, Va.
Doremus	Kincheloe	Rainey, H. T.	Wright
Doughton	King	Raker	Young, Tex.
Drane	Lankford	Randall, Wis.	
Drewry	Larsen	Rhodes	
Dunbar		Robison, Ky.	

NAYS—205.

Ackerman	Chindblom	Fess	Hawley
Andrews, Nebr.	Christopherson	Fish	Hays
Anthony	Cole	Fordney	Hernandez
Ashbrook	Connally	Foster	Hersey
Bacharach	Cooper	Frear	Hickey
Barbour	Crago	Freeman	Hicks
Bee	Cramton	French	Hill
Begg	Crisp	Fuller	Hoch
Benham	Dale	Gallagher	Houghton
Black	Dallinger	Gallivan	Hullings
Bland, Ind.	Darrow	Garner	Husted
Blanton	Davis, Minn.	Glynn	Hutchinson
Boies	Dempsey	Good	Jefferis
Britten	Dickinson, Iowa	Goodykoontz	Johnson, S. Dak.
Brooks, Ill.	Dominick	Graham, Ill.	Johnson, Wash.
Browne	Dowell	Green, Iowa	Jones, Pa.
Buchanan	Dunn	Greene, Mass.	Jones, Tex.
Burdick	Echols	Greene, Vt.	Juul
Burke	Edmonds	Griest	Kearns
Burroughs	Elliot	Hadley	Kelley, Mich.
Butler	Elston	Hamilton	Kelly, Pa.
Byrnes, S. C.	Esch	Hardy, Colo.	Kendall
Campbell, Kans.	Evans, Nebr.	Harrel	Kless
Cannon	Evans, Nev.	Hastings	Kinkaid
Carter	Fairfield	Hauger	Klecza

Knutson
Kraus
Lampert
Lanham
Layton
Longworth
Luca
McAndrews
McArthur
McClintic
McFadden
McKenzie
McKeown
McKinley
McLaughlin, Mich.
McLaughlin, Nebr.
McLeod
McPherson
MacGregor
Madden
Magee
Mann, Ill.
Mapes
Merritt
Michener
Miller
Mondell

Moore, Ohio
Mott
Newton, Minn.
Nolan
Osborne
Paige
Parker
Parrish
Patterson
Peters
Phelan
Porter
Purnell
Quinn
Radcliffe
Rainey, J. W.
Ramseyer
Randall, Calif.
Ransley
Rayburn
Reavis
Reber
Reed, N. Y.
Ricketts
Rogers
Rose
Sanders, N. Y.

Schall
Scott
Sells
Shreve
Siegel
Sinnott
Slason
Slomp
Smith, Idaho
Smith, Ill.
Smith, Mich.
Snell
Snyder
Stevenson
Strong, Kans.
Summers, Wash.
Summers, Tex.
Sweet
Swindall
Swope
Taylor, Colo.
Taylor, Tenn.
Temple
Thompson
Tilson
Timberlake
Tinchier

Towner
Treadway
Vaile
Vestal
Voigt
Volk
Volstead
Walters
Walsh
Ward
Wason
Watson
Webster
Welling
Wheeler
White, Kans.
Williams
Wilson, Ill.
Winslow
Wood, Ind.
Woodyard
Yates
Young, N. Dak.
Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Newton, Mo.

NOT VOTING—102.

Anderson	Ellsworth	Loneragan	Riordan
Andrews, Md.	Emerson	Luffkin	Robinson, N. C.
Ayres	Ferris	McCulloch	Rowan
Babka	Focht	McGlennnon	Rowe
Baer	Gandy	McKinley	Rucker
Blackmon	Ganly	McLane	Sabath
Bland, Mo.	Goldfogle	Maher	Sanders, Ind.
Bowers	Goodall	Mann, S. C.	Sanders, La.
Brinson	Goodwin, Ark.	Mead	Sanford
Brooks, Pa.	Gould	Milligan	Scully
Brumbaugh	Graham, Pa.	Moon	Steenerson
Campbell, Pa.	Hamill	Mooney	Stephens, Miss.
Candler	Harrison	Moore, Ind.	Stiness
Carew	Hersman	Morin	Strong, Pa.
Carss	Ireland	Mudd	Sullivan
Casey	James, Mich.	Murphy	Tague
Clark, Fla.	Johnston, N. Y.	Neely	Tinkham
Classon	Kahn	Nelson, Wis.	Upshaw
Copley	Kennedy, Iowa	Nicholls	Vare
Costello	Kennedy, R. I.	Oiney	Watkins
Crowther	Kettner	Pell	Weaver
Currie, Mich.	Kitchin	Perlman	Whaley
Dent	Kreider	Rainey, Ala.	White, Me.
Donovan	Langley	Ramsey	Wise
Dooling	Lehlbach	Reed, W. Va.	
Eagan	Little	Riddick	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. MOON.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. TAGUE.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WHITE of Maine with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. WISE.

Mr. VARE with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. GOULD with Mr. WEAVER.

Mr. ANDERSON with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. EAGAN.

Mr. ROWE with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. CLASSON with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. CANDLER.

Mr. BAER with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. McLANE.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. NICHOLLS.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. CURRIE of Michigan with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. SABATH.

Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. CASEY.

Mr. LITTLE with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. MEAD.
 Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. GOLDFEGLER.
 Mr. COPLEY with Mr. GANDY.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. MCGLENNON.
 Mr. MURPHY with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.
 Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. MCKINNEY.
 Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. GANLY.
 Mr. STINESS with Mr. MAHER.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.
 The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. DEMPSEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 517. An act amending an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, approved March 27, 1914;

H. R. 8881. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of New Carlisle, Ind.;

H. R. 7050. An act for the relief of the First State Bank of Kerrville, Kerr County, State of Texas;

H. R. 11572. An act for the relief of the John E. Moore Co.; and

H. R. 12634. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Alexanderson.
 The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3737. An act to carry out the provisions of an act approved July 1, 1902, known as the act entitled "An act to accept, ratify, and confirm a proposed agreement submitted by the Kansas or Kaw Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes," and to provide for a settlement to Addie May Auld and Archie William Auld, who were enrolled as members of the said tribe after the lands and money of said tribe had been divided;

S. 684. An act for the payment of certain money to Albert H. Reynolds;

S. 2682. An act for the relief of Blanche Winters;

S. 4516. An act providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern judicial district of the State of West Virginia;

S. 4826. An act to amend section 5 of the act to incorporate the American Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905;

S. 4643. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended by the act of July 11, 1919; and

S. 4891. An act to amend section 1 of an act approved February 26, 1919, entitled "An act to fix the salaries of the clerks of the United States district courts and to provide for their office expenses, and for other purposes."

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 4434. An act for the relief of contributors of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4897. An act to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 684. An act for the payment of certain money to Albert H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4516. An act providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern judicial district of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3737. An act to carry out the provisions of an act approved July 1, 1902, known as the act entitled "An act to accept, ratify, and confirm a proposed agreement submitted by the Kansas or Kaw Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes," and to provide for a settlement to Addie May Auld and Archie William Auld, who were enrolled as members of the said tribe after the lands and money of said tribe had been divided; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 4643. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended by the act of July 11, 1919; to the Committee on Education.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that January 29 they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill:

H. R. 12502. An act providing for a report on the cost of improving and maintaining the Government boulevard on Missionary Ridge, in the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GOOD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana reserves all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have objected to the other unanimous-consent requests, and I regret I shall have to object to this one.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill; and, pending that motion, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] if we can agree upon the time for general debate. How much time does the gentleman desire to use?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for about three hours. I should think we could finish the general debate in the afternoon; we could perhaps cut down the time a little.

Mr. ANTHONY. Would it be satisfactory to the gentleman to consume this afternoon in general debate, the time to be divided equally between myself and the gentleman from Mississippi, with the understanding that we take up the bill under the five-minute rule to-morrow?

Mr. SISSON. I would be very glad to do that, Mr. Speaker, if I were certain we could have a quorum; but I would not like to agree to that and then have some Members cut out when all the time was taken up by calling the roll.

Mr. ANTHONY. Would it be satisfactory to limit debate to four hours if the time is equally divided?

Mr. SISSON. That would necessitate my cutting down the time of gentlemen who have requested 20 minutes and 30 minutes, and so on. I would rather agree to make it four hours, two hours on each side, rather than take up the whole afternoon.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is agreeable to me if agreeable to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to four hours, the time to be equally divided, two hours to a side. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Reserving the right to object, would the gentleman be willing to incorporate in his unanimous request the condition that all remarks be confined to the bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think not.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilton] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15943, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill.

During the reading of the bill the following colloquies occurred:

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill for the first time be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to prefer a unanimous-consent request. None of us is listening to the bill, and it is a waste of time to have it read. I prefer the unanimous-consent request that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with. It will take an hour and a half to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I am keeping up with the reading of the Clerk, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin. Would it be in order to ask that the reading clerk and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] should retire and go out to lunch? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to prefer a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fess). The gentleman will state his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BLANTON. As a preface to my unanimous-consent request—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I object to any preface. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I say, as a preface to my request—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the House be conserved by dispensing with the further reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, this is an important bill. I have not had the opportunity heretofore to read it, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that a whole paragraph was skipped. I have been keeping up with the reading of the bill, and I think the RECORD ought to show that all of the bill has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to prefer a unanimous-consent request that in lieu of the useless reading of the present bill, to which no one is paying any attention, the Clerk read the very interesting story by Mr. William Shakespeare entitled "Much Ado About Nothing." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The Chair will not recognize the gentleman for that purpose. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair permit a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of no quorum. That is a preferential point.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask whether the bill is being read for the benefit of the Members or for the benefit of the visitors in the galleries?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members present, a quorum. The Clerk will continue the reading.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, this bill makes appropriations for the Army for the fiscal year 1922. The committee that has had it under consideration has sought to provide sufficient funds for a Regular Army of 150,000 men.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15943, the Army appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill, and I move that general debate thereon be limited to four hours, to be divided equally between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] and myself.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is the gentleman willing to ask that the debate shall be limited to the bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think in view of the fact that gentlemen have already been promised time, I can not do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves that general debate be limited to four hours, and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. McCLINTIC)—ayes 89, no 1.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point that no quorum is present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. All those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Kansas will, when their names are called, answer "aye," and those opposed will answer "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 279, nays 2, answered "present" 2, not voting 146, as follows:

YEAS—279.

Ackerman	Chindblom	Fish	Johnson, Miss.
Almon	Christopherson	Fisher	Jones, Pa.
Anderson	Clark, Mo.	Flood	Jones, Tex.
Andrews, Md.	Cleary	Fordney	Juhl
Andrews, Nebr.	Coady	Foster	Kahn
Anthony	Cole	Frear	Kearns
Ashbrook	Collier	Freeman	Keller
Aswell	Cooper	French	Kelley, Mich.
Ayres	Crago	Fuller	Kelley, Pa.
Bacharach	Cramton	Garner	Kendall
Bankhead	Crisp	Garrett	Kiess
Barbour	Cullen	Glynn	King
Barkley	Curry, Calif.	Good	Kinkaid
Bee	Dale	Goodykoontz	Knutson
Begg	Dallinger	Graham, Ill.	Kraus
Bell	Darrow	Green, Iowa	Lanham
Benham	Davey	Greene, Mass.	Lankford
Black	Davis, Minn.	Greene, Vt.	Larsen
Black, Va.	Davis, Tenn.	Griest	Layton
Blanton	Dempsey	Griffin	Lazaro
Boles	Dickinson, Iowa	Hadley	Leblach
Bowling	Dickinson, Mo.	Hamilton	Lesher
Box	Dominick	Hardy, Colo.	Linthicum
Brand	Doremus	Hardy, Tex.	Little
Briggs	Doughton	Hastings	Longworth
Brinson	Dowell	Hayden	Luce
Brooks, Ill.	Drane	Hernandez	Luhling
Browne	Drewry	Hersey	McAndrews
Buchanan	Dunbar	Hickey	McArthur
Burdick	Dunn	Hicks	McFadden
Burke	Dupré	Hill	McKenzie
Burroughs	Dyer	Hoch	McKeown
Butler	Echols	Hoey	McLeod
Byrnes, S. C.	Edmonds	Houghton	McPherson
Byrnes, Tenn.	Elliot	Howard	MacGregor
Caldwell	Elston	Hudspeth	Madden
Campbell, Kans.	Esch	Hull, Iowa	Magee
Cannon	Evans, Mont.	Humphreys	Major
Cantrill	Evans, Nebr.	Igoe	Mann, Ill.
Caraway	Fairfield	James, Va.	Mansfield
Carss	Fess	Jeffers	Mapes
Carter	Fields	Johnson, Ky.	Mason

Merritt	Raker	Small	Timberlake
Michener	Ramseyer	Smith, Idaho	Towner
Miller	Randall, Calif.	Smith, Ill.	Treadway
Minahan, N. J.	Randall, Wis.	Smith, Mich.	Vaile
Mondell	Ransley	Smith, N. Y.	Vestal
Moore, Ohio	Rayburn	Smithwick	Vinson
Moore, Va.	Reavis	Snell	Volk
Mott	Reber	Snyder	Volstead
Neely	Reed, N. Y.	Steagall	Walsh
Newton, Minn.	Rhodes	Stedman	Walters
Newton, Mo.	Ricketts	Stephens, Ohio	Wason
O'Connell	Robinson, N. C.	Stevenson	Watson
O'Connor	Robison, Ky.	Stiness	Webster
Ogden	Rodenberg	Stull	Welling
Oldfield	Rogers	Strong, Kans.	Welty
Oliver	Romjue	Summers, Wash.	Wheeler
Osborne	Rose	Summers, Tex.	Williams
Overstreet	Rouse	Sweet	Wilson, Ill.
Padgett	Sanders, La.	Swindall	Wilson, La.
Paige	Sanders, N. Y.	Swope	Wingo
Park	Schall	Taylor, Ark.	Winslow
Parrish	Scott	Taylor, Colo.	Wood, Ind.
Patterson	Sherwood	Taylor, Tenn.	Woods, Va.
Peters	Shreve	Temple	Woodyard
Phelan	Siegel	Thomas	Wright
Pou	Sinclair	Thompson	Young, N. Dak.
Quin	Sisson	Tillman	Zihlman
Radcliffe	Slemp	Tilson	

NAYS—2.

McClintic Sears

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Huddleston Stephens, Miss.

NOT VOTING—146.

Babka	Gard	Lufkin	Reed, W. Va.
Baer	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Riddick
Benson	Goldfogle	McDuffie	Riordan
Blackmon	Goodall	McGlennnon	Rowan
Bland, Ind.	Goodwin, Ark.	McKiniry	Rowe
Bland, Mo.	Gould	McKinley	Rubey
Bowers	Graham, Pa.	McLane	Rucker
Britten	Hamill	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sabath
Brooks, Pa.	Harrell	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sanders, Ind.
Brumbaugh	Harrison	Maher	Sanford
Campbell, Pa.	Haugen	Mann, S. C.	Scully
Candler	Hawley	Martin	Sells
Carew	Hays	Mays	Sims
Casey	Hersman	Mead	Sinnot
Clark, Fla.	Holland	Milligan	Steele
Classon	Hulings	Monahan, Wis.	Steenerson
Connally	Hull, Tenn.	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Copley	Husted	Moon	Sullivan
Costello	Hutchinson	Mooney	Tague
Crowther	Ireland	Moore, Ind.	Tincher
Currie, Mich.	Jacoway	Morin	Tinkham
Denison	James, Mich.	Mudd	Upshaw
Dent	Johnson, S. Dak.	Murphy	Vare
Dewalt	Johnson, Wash.	Nelson, Mo.	Venable
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Nelson, Wis.	Voigt
Dooling	Kennedy, Iowa	Nicholls	Ward
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Nolan	Watkins
Eagle	Kettner	Olney	Weaver
Ellsworth	Kincheloe	Parker	Whaley
Emerson	Kitchin	Pell	White, Kans.
Evans, Nev.	Klecza	Perlman	White, Me.
Ferris	Kreider	Porter	Wilson, Pa.
Focht	Lampert	Purnell	Wise
Gallagher	Langley	Rainey, Ala.	Yates
Gallivan	Lea, Calif.	Rainey, Henry T.	Young, Tex.
Gandy	Lee, Ga.	Rainey, John W.	
Ganly	Loneragan	Ramsey	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. VARE with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. CONNALLY.

Mr. LAMPERT with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas with Mr. VENABLE.

Mr. YATES with Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. JACOWAY.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. GARD.

Mr. KLECZKA with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. SINNOTT with Mr. RUBEY.

Mr. PARKER with Mr. YOUNG of Texas.

Mr. VOIGT with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin with Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. BAER with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. BABKA.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. KINCHELOE.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. LEA of California.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. WARD with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.

Mr. TINCHER with Mr. MAYS.

Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. NELSON of Missouri with Mr. McDUFFIE.

Mr. NOLAN with Mr. RAKER.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska with Mr. DENT.

Mr. DENISON with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. HAYS with Mr. GANLY.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. PELL.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. UPSHAW.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

On motion of Mr. ANTHONY, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 15943) with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, in response to the demand of the people of this country, and in accord with the sentiment of the membership of this House, the Committee on Appropriations in reporting this bill have materially reduced the amount which has heretofore been appropriated for the maintenance of the Army. We are going to try to put an end to some of the waste and extravagance which has characterized the conduct of the Military Establishment in recent years. In reducing to the sum which is appropriated for the maintenance of the Military Establishment, I do not believe we will impair to any serious degree any of the many activities of that great organization.

The War Department in their estimates asked for the appropriation of \$694,000,000. This committee has reported to the House a bill which will give the War Department approximately \$328,000,000 for the conduct of the Army for the next fiscal year. For the current year there was appropriated the sum of \$390,000,000 for the Military Establishment. It was the intention of this House, then, to appropriate for an Army of 175,000 men. We are advised by the Chief of Finance that there will be a deficit in the pay of the Army in the amount appropriated for that purpose the current year, for an Army of 175,000 men, of about \$25,000,000, and that there will be a total deficiency this year of over \$100,000,000, so that the total cost of the Military Establishment for the current year will be about \$494,000,000. We propose to conduct it the next year at a total cost of about \$331,000,000, including both the Army and the West Point Military Academy, which has heretofore been carried as a separate appropriation bill, but which this year has been included in the Army appropriation bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are providing for an Army of 150,000 enlisted men in the Regular Establishment. This is really an Army of 160,000, because we also provide for about 6,500 Philippine Scouts, and there are authorized in the reorganization bill 2,500 flying cadets, for whom provision is made, so that we are practically providing for an Army of 160,000.

Now, the criticism has been made that it will be impossible to get the Regular Establishment down to a basis of 150,000 men during the next fiscal year. The committee have carefully investigated the facts again, and we do not believe there is the slightest doubt that the Army can be easily reduced from its present total of about 234,000 men to 150,000 men during the next fiscal year and that 150,000 men will be ample to provide properly for all the military requirements of the Nation.

It is contended that 234,000 men are now enlisted in the Army and that we can not get rid of them in time to cut down our force to 150,000 men during the next fiscal year. Now, this number of enlisted men is made up of about 60 per cent three-year enlistments and about 40 per cent one-year enlistments. Investigations made so far by the General Staff develop the fact that there will be no trouble in bringing the Army down by July next to the 175,000 men required by the resolution which the House passed the other day demanding that the War Department reduce to that number. But if we simply cease enlisting, and permit the one-year men at the expiration of their enlistment to go out of the Army, and if we further liberalize the regulations, which are now very drastic, and prevent any man from getting out of the Army of his own free will after he has enlisted, except by reason of death or dependency—if we liberalize those regulations, there will be enough men who will want to go out of the Army so that the number can be reduced easily to the 150,000 men for whom we provide.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Of this 150,000 or 160,000 men whom the gentleman speaks of I would like to ask, will any appreciable number of them be privates?

Mr. ANTHONY. Quite a large number of them, of course, will be privates. But I will say to the gentleman that we are

appropriating in this bill for 14,000 commissioned officers, not that we have any desire to limit the number of commissioned officers provided in the reorganization bill, which was 17,000, but because we think 14,000 is the number that there will be of commissioned officers in the next fiscal year, and included in that number are a large body of men who were emergency officers during the war, practically all of whom have had training in actual warfare under modern battle conditions, and their retention in the military service is one of the greatest and one of the most reasonable assets along the line of military preparedness that we can provide for at this time.

We are taking into the Regular service over 5,000 emergency officers, men trained in the late war and now given commissions in the Regular service, and they, with the officers already commissioned, make up this total of 14,000.

We must not lose sight of the fact that, in addition to these 150,000 men of the Regular Establishment, liberal provision is being made for the growth of the National Guard. It now numbers nearly 100,000 men. We figure that it will expand to 125,000 or 140,000 during the next fiscal year; and if the National Guard can have sympathetic treatment at the hands of the War Department, and be permitted to grow and expand under the provisions of the law, it will easily reach the maximum for which that law provides and make a very efficient and strong second line of military defense in this country.

We must also not lose sight of the fact that back of the Regular Army and back of this National Guard are the millions of trained men, the veteran soldiers who come to us as a result of the Great War, who also form a tremendous asset along the line of military preparedness.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Upon what theory of consistency does the Committee on Appropriations provide for an Army of 150,000 men, when only a few days ago both branches of Congress passed a resolution fixing the minimum Army at 175,000 enlisted men?

Mr. ANTHONY. Along the lines of economy and reducing the public expenditures at this time.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will permit, the House did not have an opportunity to vote on an Army of 150,000 men. We were left to the one proposition of voting for 175,000 or voting to leave the Army where it is now, because that resolution was brought up under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is correct.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And we did not fix a minimum of 175,000. We fixed a maximum of 175,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is equivalent to a minimum.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that there is no attempt in this bill to arbitrarily fix a maximum, except that we are appropriating an amount that will pay 150,000 men and 14,000 officers.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. How many men does the gentleman expect to be in the Army the 1st day of July of this year?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think there will be about 175,000, if the War Department will go to work wholeheartedly toward reducing the number of men.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They are not going to work at it at present. I understand that they are still recruiting and that you are paying \$90 bonus for every man that you can reenlist.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the gentleman mean that we are paying it or that the War Department is paying it?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The War Department; and you are appropriating the money and paying \$90 to-day for a man to reenlist, and yet the gentleman admits that he is going to reduce the Army when the Army is increasing all of the time.

Mr. ANTHONY. After March 4 I guarantee to the gentleman that the Army will be reduced, and rapidly reduced. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Would it not be a good plan to pass some provision by which we could stop enlistments and reenlistments?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think that was the intention of the House when it passed the resolution introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It might have been the intention, but the resolution did not stop it. The gentleman understands that.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; but I have a report in my pocket from the General Staff that says that the Army can be reduced to

175,000 men by July, and I take it that it is the intention of the department to so reduce it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The Adjutant General says that the most that they can do is to cut it down to 199,000 by the 1st of July.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say to the gentleman that even though the department does not act fully in accordance with the resolution passed by the House and the Senate, even though they do not arbitrarily refuse to reenlist men whose enlistments expire and who are asking for it, yet I say the next administration has the power under the articles of enlistment that are signed by every enlisted man to discharge any enlisted man or as many enlisted men as it may please at any time.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Would the gentleman advocate such a step?

Mr. ANTHONY. I certainly would, if necessary.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Does this bill provide for the retention of all of these emergency officers who have been commissioned in the Regular Army, but whose appointments have not yet been confirmed?

Mr. ANTHONY. It does take care of all appointments to the commissioned grades which are now pending in the Senate.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I was much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] that he thought the National Guard would be increased materially if it could receive the sympathetic attitude of the War Department. Will the gentleman be kind enough to inform us whether the matter under existing law is dependent upon the sympathetic attitude of the War Department? I think we would like to know just exactly what the situation is in regard to that.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am sorry to say that that has been the case heretofore. I do not think it is any secret; it is known to anyone who has kept tab on military matters in this country, that ever since the armistice it has been the determined policy of the War Department to try to kill off the National Guard. The National Guard were discharged wholesale when they returned from France with the idea that they would go completely out of existence as individuals and as organizations, and it has only been due to the fact that the returning soldiers who came back from France, who were members of the National Guard organizations which distinguished themselves over there, made up their minds that they would perpetuate their organizations and continue them in the National Guard of the United States, and the War Department has been compelled to permit a certain number of them to qualify as national guardsmen.

The War Department has imposed in my opinion serious handicaps to the reorganization of the guard, handicaps because they are insisting that each State must organize the guard along the same lines as the Regular Army, insisting that each State shall establish technical units of the National Guard which are expensive and difficult to organize, instead of permitting them to organize along natural lines of infantry organization, which is not only the most popular and most effective but costs much less money to maintain.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield first to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Kansas if it is not only fair to say of the War Department that in discharging the National Guard from the Federal service there was no law in existence at the time whereby the National Guard of the various States could be returned to their former status as national guardsmen, but that defect has since been cured by legislation. Is not that true?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think they could have avoided that step, because, if the gentleman will remember, it was the gentleman from Illinois, himself, who offered an amendment to one of the war bills enacted by this Congress to the effect that the organizations which went into the Federal service during the war from the various States should be maintained in their entirety as such organizations. That amendment and that law were absolutely ignored by the War Department, and they had the idea then in mind of disorganizing the guard by refusing to obey the law. I yield now to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. FIELDS. Has there not been a feeling on the part of the National Guard for many years that they did not have the sympathetic cooperation of the War Department?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is no question about that.

Mr. FIELDS. I submit this observation in order to correct an impression which the gentleman made a while ago that this

has been just since the armistice. Is it not a fact that it dates back many years?

Mr. ANTHONY. As the gentleman will recall, a great many years before the war, when we sat on the Committee on Military Affairs, many officers of the Regular Establishment were wont to come before us and belittle the National Guard—

Mr. FIELDS. And under former administrations—

Mr. ANTHONY (continuing). But the Congress has always stood by the guard, and the guard has vindicated upon the battle fields of France the good opinion we had of them as they have invariably done when called upon to perform service. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. And this has existed under former administrations as well as under the present administration?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is quite true.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does the gentleman have in mind any legislative policy that can be established after the 4th of March to change the sympathy of the War Department toward the National Guard?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. We have already made such provision. The Committee on Military Affairs last year in its reorganization act provided that the Chief of the Militia Bureau should be a National Guard officer selected by the governors of the States. The War Department has made such appointment of a National Guard officer, but I am very sorry to say they did not listen to the recommendations of the governors of the States.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for a question on another point?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Can the gentleman state, approximately, how many emergency officers of the war are retained in the Army now and come within the numbers of those who were confirmed last Saturday by the Senate?

Mr. ANTHONY. About 5,200, as I remember.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is the total number of confirmations.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the total number of emergency officers appointed to the Regular Army.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman will yield further, that is about the total number of confirmations made by the Senate; I figured they averaged about that, but I understood many of those appointments confirmed by the Senate were men already in the Regular Army line.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the committee in drafting the bill made an investigation as to what effect the varying policies of the Government as to the number of enlisted men will have on the efficiency of the War Department? For instance, we first passed a bill fixing 280,000 as the number of enlisted men of the Army. Then the appropriation bill appropriated, as it was claimed, for an Army of 175,000, or 10 per cent under 175,000, and it was claimed on the floor of the House that the Secretary violated the instructions of the Congress in enlisting over 175,000. Now we come with 150,000, all within a few months' time, and I would like to know whether or not the committee has investigated that and whether it would not have a serious effect on the efficiency of the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that one of the members of the committee which framed this bill has investigated and has reason to believe that the number of men that this Congress appropriates for to compose the Army of the United States during the next fiscal year will be faithfully adhered to and observed by the Government after the 4th of March.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know whether the gentleman desires to discuss it at this time or not, but I am interested in the matter of the return home of the soldiers in Germany. If the gentleman does not desire to discuss that now I will take it up later, but I would like to have some information about that.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think our committee has official information in regard to when the men who compose the army of occupation on the Rhine will be returned, but the Secretary of War tells us that he has initiated the policy of no longer sending any replacements over there with the idea that ultimately they would return. And the committee has assumed

that the army that is now in Germany will be returned at an early date.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. MILLER. For a question. What was the basis for fixing the number at 150,000 men? Why not 125,000 or 175,000? How did the committee come to arrive at the number of 150,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. The number was fixed after a careful study of the actual requirements of the country. We took into consideration the number of men who would be required to garrison our outlying possessions and the number of men necessary to be maintained in garrisons in this country, including the Coast Artillery for our fortifications, a force on the border, and for the various military posts in this country—

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for another short question?

Mr. ANTHONY. And we concluded that 150,000 was about the right number.

Mr. MILLER. Did the gentleman's committee take into consideration the world's condition, or did it fix it entirely upon conditions within the United States?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; we took into consideration every condition, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. How did the gentleman arrive at the world's condition, through what sources of information, as to form a basis of the United States Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. We made up our minds that the probability was very small that this country would be called upon to participate in any foreign war, and we figured on the size of an Army that would be most proper for the purposes of the defense of this country and for the maintenance of domestic peace and order.

Mr. MILLER. Minimizing the chances of any increase of the Army because of the world's condition, you probably allowed the Army sufficient to meet the demand within the United States?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think so. And let me go further in answer to the gentleman and say if we should be called upon to participate in any great world's war that to-day this country is better prepared, from a military standpoint, than any other nation on the face of the earth. We have more guns, cannon, artillery of all kinds, and of the most modern kind, built and in storage, than any other nation in the world, and we have more ammunition than those 10,000 or 12,000 big field guns can fire off in about 20 years.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit me, in answer to the gentleman I would like to state that my idea as to the committee fixing this Army at 150,000 men or 160,000 men was to fix at least 10 men to each officer, that they had already provided for, and which personnel they could not change.

Mr. MILLER. I did not seek information from the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I wanted to get some definite information.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the gentleman from Texas needs a course of instruction at the hands of the Military Committee. The duties of the commissioned officers in our Army for the next few years will not be entirely confined to officering the different regiments and organizations. We find that it is going to take for the purposes of military training in this country at schools and colleges 1,000 officers. It will take another 1,000 to train the National Guard. It will take another thousand for vocational-training purposes, and hundreds of them will be required in many other activities away from their regiments, to say nothing of the work of educating the officers themselves. The commissioned force of the Army will be very busy during the next few years.

Mr. BLANTON. I knew the gentleman would find something for them to do, because they are already here.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will permit, I wish to say that quite a number of the bureaus in the War Department have nothing but officers. There are no privates in those departments at all—such as the Judge Advocate General and the Inspector General Departments—and perhaps that would make the average of officers to the enlisted personnel much larger.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. On the basis of 150,000 men for your Army, what will the strength of the Infantry be?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think the committee has figured out the strength of the different organizations. That is a matter which we would leave to the War Department.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. You do not mean to say that you have come before Congress and have not figured on the strength of the different branches of the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. I suppose it will be based on the strength of the branches as fixed in the reorganization act. The gentle-

man knows that. Now, if we reduce the Army, I presume it will keep it in the same relative proportion.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. And what is that relative proportion?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will refer the gentleman to his committee's bill, which the gentleman helped to prepare.

Mr. FIELDS. The committee by limiting the appropriation has reduced the enlisted personnel about 47 per cent. What per cent of decrease has it made in the commissioned personnel?

Mr. ANTHONY. It has made no attempt to decrease the commissioned personnel.

Mr. FIELDS. So it will be as great for an Army of 150,000 men as was provided for an Army of 280,000 men? Are we to so understand?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. The War Department has authority to commission seventeen thousand and some hundred of officers, if it is desired.

Mr. FIELDS. That is not impaired?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is not impaired by anything in this bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas, in speaking of the number of commissioned officers of the Army it is very apt to mislead almost anyone not thoroughly familiar with the Military Establishment, for the reason that the preachers and the doctors and the veterinarians and the dentists are all classed as commissioned officers? And when you think of the number as a whole it is confusing in taking into consideration men commissioned to lead the fighting?

Mr. FIELDS. Will it require as many doctors and preachers for 150,000 men as for 280,000?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman, if the gentleman from Kansas will permit, that the Surgeon General of the Army contends that he ought to have his full quota of 6½ per cent of officers for the entire authorized enlisted strength of the Army, regardless of how many enlisted men there are.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield for another suggestion?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. FIELDS. Is it not a fact that under your Army reorganization bill passed last fall, followed by the legislation that you are now adopting with limitation, you have got an Army that is top-heavy with its commissioned personnel?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think not.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield.

Mr. DUNBAR. Can the gentleman tell the House the cost in the present year of maintaining an army of occupation on the Rhine?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not give the cost for the present year, but it was developed before the committee that the total cost of maintaining the army on the Rhine up to December 4, as I remember it, was \$277,000,000, and of that amount the German Government has paid about \$34,000,000 on account.

Mr. DUNBAR. Did that include the calendar year or the fiscal year?

Mr. ANTHONY. It was the total amount from the time that our Army moved into Germany down to last month.

Mr. DUNBAR. Another question, please. If the next administration declares the war with Germany to be at an end, those soldiers will be withdrawn and there will be that much money saved?

Mr. ANTHONY. There will.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit? That will depend upon the terms of the resolution in which peace is declared, will it not? This is a rather interesting question. If peace is declared, the provisions of the treaty will still be in effect. I do not know whether the soldiers would be withdrawn or not.

If peace is declared by resolution, I should suppose that the resolution would fix whether or not the troops are going to be withdrawn. The gentleman would not want to commit himself on that?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that the committee has gone on the assumption that the army of occupation in Germany will be entirely withdrawn at a very early date.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. The cost of \$270,000,000 for the army that we have in Germany up to the 1st of January was for how long a period of time? Was it from the time we put them there up to that date?

Mr. ANTHONY. Wait a minute and I will give it to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIN. And therefore I would like to know the number of men we have there now, and what the average has been which has aggregated that enormous sum of \$270,000,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that the first charge was for the month of December, 1918, when the cost was \$34,344,000. The German Government paid \$6,770,000 that month. Then during the year 1919 the bills were made in three periods—one of \$113,000,000, one of \$16,000,000, and one of \$25,000,000. The German Government made two payments on that, one of \$8,000,000 and one of \$14,000,000. In 1920 there were two charges, one of \$7,000,000 on March 31 and one of \$7,000,000 on June 30. The German Government made two payments, one of \$1,300,000 and one of \$1,000,000, making the total charges of \$257,000,000 and total payments \$32,000,000, leaving a balance in favor of the United States on June 30 of \$225,000,000. Of course, that has increased very considerably since.

Mr. QUIN. At the close of the session of Congress last year I read a letter from the Secretary of War to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, which did not get into the Record, which showed that it cost \$25,000 a year for each one of those soldiers that we have over there. I want to know whether that is correct, and whether it is still costing that much, and why such an enormous charge as that should be charged for the maintenance of those soldiers?

Mr. ANTHONY. Under the terms of the armistice the German Government is supposed to pay the expense of the American army of occupation.

Mr. QUIN. Admitting that to be true, how can this Government charge such outrageous sums for the maintenance of a soldier in Germany as compared with the cost of maintaining him in the United States?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have not the exact figures, but I will say that all of the cost of the maintenance of the army of occupation in Germany is included in the appropriation bills that Congress has passed from year to year for the support of the Regular Army, and there were items included in the estimates for this bill for that purpose, but we eliminated them entirely from the estimates when we framed this bill.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I will yield first to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, before we get entirely away from the 150,000 Army, I would like to ask this question: I think most people visualize an army from the number of men who carry guns. How many of the 150,000 men would be actually field men, carrying guns?

Mr. ANTHONY. There are a very large number in the different special corps of the Army. I will try to give the gentleman the figures here. I will try to hunt that up later, but I would say that there would be 40,000, anyway, in the different special corps.

Mr. SNYDER. Then there would be 40,000 out of the 150,000 that would be actually mobile troops?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. There would be about 110,000 or 120,000.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KAHN. The testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs covering a period of years was that of the enlisted personnel of every 10 men 6 were in the combat service and 4 in the auxiliary.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. I am obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Is it not true that if you put your Army at 150,000, you will not have quite 60,000 in the Infantry?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will tell the gentleman that I know nothing in regard to the details upon which any sized Army would be made up during the next fiscal year.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think the answer to the question is that you would have less than 60,000 actual Infantry carrying arms.

Mr. SNYDER. That is exactly what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. SIGSON. Oh, Mr. Chairman, that is not exactly a fair statement.

Mr. ANTHONY. You have Field Artillery, and you have Coast Artillery, Cavalry, Engineers, Signal Corps, tank, chemical, and other fighting units, which would run the number of fighting men up to 110,000 or 115,000 men out of the total of 150,000.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to ask another question. I am somewhat mystified myself in trying to get at the exact

figures that the War Department is putting out. Since the gentleman has informed me I am still more mystified. The gentleman spoke of having 175,000 in the Army on the 1st of July. I have before me in the hearings on the deficiency bill, page 232, the testimony of Gen. Lord, estimating the strength of the Army and putting it at the 1st of August at 200,411. I do not understand these different sets of figures. I had one the other day which was corrected in a very short time by the War Department, so that I think most of them are guessing.

Mr. ANTHONY. I advise the gentleman not to base any of his theories upon figures that come from the War Department. [Laughter.]

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. I was very much interested in the gentleman's statement as to the policy of the incoming administration concerning the disposition of the army of occupation. Can the gentleman give us any information as to when they will be brought home?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have no knowledge as to when.

Mr. FISHER. And I will ask the gentleman under what conditions they will be brought home? Will they be summarily brought home?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not answer that.

Mr. FISHER. Can we anticipate a further reduction in the number of enlisted men in the Army when the army of occupation is brought home?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think so. After March 4 you can rest assured all these things will happen.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to ask the gentleman if the soldiers now in Germany may be looked upon as voluntarily there?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think most of them have enlisted for foreign service. In fact, I understand that the service in Germany is very popular, because the American dollar is worth a vastly larger sum when computed in German marks.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. While we were considering the Army reorganization bill last summer I asked the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] how many men we had in Germany and how much it cost per day to maintain that army abroad. In response to the question I asked him to read a letter from the Secretary of War indicating that the cost since the armistice was signed would average \$1,220,000 a day. That being carried to its logical conclusion would result in about \$1,000,000,000 of expense since the armistice was signed, for the army over there, as against the figures now given by the War Department to the subcommittee having charge of this bill.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No; let me finish my question. Now, I should like to know whether or not the information in possession of the gentleman's subcommittee covers the questions that were involved in the colloquy that took place between the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and myself at that time.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. First I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan and then to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me call attention to these figures that were before the committee, that in the month of December, 1918, the cost was \$34,000,000, which would be a little over a million dollars a day; whereas in the three months from April to June of this year it was \$7,000,000, a much smaller figure per day, due probably to the reduction of the force.

Mr. ANTHONY. Now I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman will recall that immediately after that first letter of the Secretary of War was read to the House he followed it with another letter saying that it was that amount while the great number of soldiers were in the occupied territory, and I think he referred to the fact that we had as many as 250,000 soldiers in the occupied territory then, but that the cost had fallen as the men were brought home, and I think he gave the exact cost that was being paid by Germany at that time.

Mr. MADDEN. So that as a matter of fact the figures that are now reported by the department to the Appropriations Committee do not tell the exact story, and it amounts to a good deal more money than what it seems to amount to on its face.

Mr. ANTHONY. I might say for the gentleman's information that we were assured by the War Department at the beginning of our hearings on this bill that the amount of the expense of the maintenance of our Army in Germany had been paid in

full, and it was only after further questions that we found that such was not the case.

Mr. MADDEN. I think if the matter were more thoroughly investigated it would be found that we have gone to an expense of \$1,000,000,000 to maintain the American Army in occupied German territory since the armistice was signed.

Mr. CRAMTON. If my colleague will yield in that connection, as illustrating the force of the chairman's statement a moment ago as to the reliability of the information derived from the War Department, in the beginning of the hearings, when Gen. March, Chief of Staff, was before the subcommittee and asked about the payment for maintenance of the army of occupation in Germany, he used this language in response to a question:

I went into it with Gen. Allen, and he said he had on hand enough marks daily to pay the current expenses of the American troops there. Of course, the transportation problem is still on us. Germany will perhaps pay for it in the long run, but the running expenses day by day have been paid for some time and the marks have always been forthcoming.

Mr. ANTHONY. Have the marks been figured at their present market value?

Gen. MARCH. I do not know about that. But there is no trouble about payment; the American troops are paid right along.

Mr. CRAMTON. You mean that at Coblenz the local bills are rendered in marks and paid in marks?

Gen. MARCH. Exactly so.

Then, later in the hearing, the fact developed that only one-seventh at the most had been paid.

Mr. KAHN. The American soldiers have been paid, as I understand it, but this country has paid them, and Germany has not paid them, although Germany agreed to pay them at the time of the signing of the armistice.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I see from the hearings that we have about 16,000 soldiers in Germany now. Can the gentleman state how definite our obligation is to maintain an army there? I notice the Secretary says he expects to reduce the force to about 8,000 by December, so it would seem that we are under no exact contract and have incurred no very well-defined obligation. If that is true, why should not Congress enact legislation that will dispose of that situation by providing for a return of the troops, if it will be in violation of no agreement? [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that the committee does not know definitely just how many troops we agreed to maintain in Germany, but we did get the impression that more troops had been sent to Germany than our original agreement provided for.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that somebody ought to ascertain what the facts are in order that we may enact such legislation as may be proper and desirable?

Mr. ANTHONY. There will be no necessity for enacting it, because the troops will probably be back by the time Congress could act.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. We have waited for a statement from the department and have done nothing when we might have acted if action was admissible.

Mr. MADDEN. The President vetoed the resolution that was passed that would have enabled these troops to be brought back.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. By no means, if the provisions of the armistice fix our obligation, and not the treaty.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I have been endeavoring to ascertain the number of civilian employees in the Army. Has the chairman determined that question?

Mr. ANTHONY. That has been a mooted question. The statement has been made frequently that with the Army as now constituted for every two enlisted men there is a civilian employee. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], a member of the committee, went into that question very thoroughly and developed that there are now in the Army 102,000 civilian employees.

Mr. CRAMTON. As illustrating a further fact, the statement of the chairman is correct from information we received two days ago, but to-day it has been reduced about 10,000.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Will the gentleman tell us something about the policy which this bill provides for training in colleges?

Mr. ANTHONY. This bill provides for the continuation of training in schools and colleges and appropriates \$3,000,000 for

that purpose. There are now 100,000 young men receiving military training in schools and colleges under what are called the Reserve Officers Training Corps provisions of the bill. We propose to give them enough money so that they can keep up this activity to the fullest extent.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. KNUTSON. The question was brought up about occupation—there are two brigades in Germany at the present time, are there not?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is supposed to be a division, possibly made up of three brigades.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is a second brigade, known as the Silesian brigade, supposed to police that country while the plebiscite was held, but it has never been called into action. Why has not this Silesian brigade been called home?

Mr. ANTHONY. The troops for Silesia were dispatched from this country. When they reached the other side there was some objection to their going into Silesia.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why were they not brought back to this country?

Mr. ANTHONY. They were not brought back under the policy of the War Department.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Silesian brigade is in excess of the number that we agreed to maintain in Germany under the armistice.

Mr. ANTHONY. That probably is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to get a little light on this matter in regard to how this bill was constructed. It was framed by a subcommittee of five members, of which the gentleman was chairman. Was it afterwards submitted to the full committee?

Mr. ANTHONY. It was submitted to the full committee and debated and discussed considerably.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman care to state whether any changes were made?

Mr. ANTHONY. There were several changes made in the bill, minor changes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How long was the bill discussed by the full committee?

Mr. ANTHONY. About two hours, and it was considered about two months in the subcommittee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that, but what I wanted to find out was how much the whole committee considered it.

Mr. ANTHONY. The subcommittee felt highly complimented when it was found that except for three amendments made in the bill its work was approved by the whole committee.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Do I understand that this committee is willing to defend the policy of discharging a man who has a written contract with the Government to serve for three years? I understood him to say that they were going to discharge some.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that if it is necessary to make public expenditures come down within the limits of the receipts of the Treasury, such a step is fully justified.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Does not the gentleman think that it would have been a better plan for the committee to have first stopped the enlistments and stopped paying \$90 for a man that you are now going to discharge?

Mr. ANTHONY. Undoubtedly this House should have taken action in December and put a stop to further enlistments. I want to give due credit to the gentleman from Iowa, as I understand he introduced a bill calling for such action, and I am sorry he did not get action on it sooner.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to inquire why the gentleman's committee did not act. He will remember that about the 1st of December I called his attention to the fact that this ought to be done, and he said that his committee was going to attend to it.

Mr. ANTHONY. I consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and we found that, it being a legislative matter, it very properly belonged to the gentleman's committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. You may have talked with the chairman of the committee, but you told me it could be quickly accomplished by putting it on a deficiency bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will observe the rules of the House.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman from Iowa seems to question the right and authority of the War Department to discharge a man before his term of enlistment expires. That seems to be running through his questions. I will ask him if he ever

read the articles of enlistment. If he has he will find that the language says the man is enlisted for a specific term of years unless sooner discharged by the Secretary of War. So there is no contract that binds us to keep a man for a term of three years.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I understand that, but we have never done that.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman has intimated that 14,000 officers are more than is necessary for 150,000 men.

Mr. ANTHONY. For the purpose of line officers.

Mr. DOWELL. What will the officers do who are not needed as officers of the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that nearly every one of them will be put to some useful work. A large proportion of them will be occupied for the next few years in the development of their own military education.

Mr. DOWELL. How many officers are there in the service at the present time?

Mr. ANTHONY. Thirteen thousand one hundred.

Mr. DOWELL. Are they all in the city of Washington? [Laughter.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, no; I think there are about 1,000 here.

Mr. DOWELL. The reason I make the inquiry is because they are disposing of millions of dollars' worth of property in some of the camps, and in one I know of the highest officer there is a lieutenant, and I assume that the most of them are here in Washington and that they have no one of special rank to attend to this special service.

Mr. ANTHONY. If the gentleman will read some of the paragraphs of this bill before the House, he will see that this committee intends to put many of these officers to work.

Mr. DOWELL. If that is possible, I hope the gentleman will succeed.

Mr. KNUTSON. What kind of work?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Answering the problem raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], I want to say that if the War Department now would discharge all of the men in the Army who want to be discharged they could reduce the personnel down to at least 75,000 men.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman is quite right about that.

Mr. BLANTON. The point is that the Secretary is holding them when he has no right to do it.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield, although I want to conclude my remarks in about five minutes.

Mr. MacGREGOR. On this proposition of motor vehicles does not the committee think they could have gone to a greater extent in stopping the Army from rolling around on wheels? Practically \$5,000,000 are provided for gasoline in this bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is the gentleman referring to the appropriation for gasoline?

Mr. MacGREGOR. Yes; about \$5,000,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. About \$3,000,000 of that is provided for the Air Service. The Air Service used about three and a half million dollars' worth of gasoline in the past year.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Did not the Congress pass a resolution prohibiting officers from joy riding around in these cars?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; and I think that has been largely done away with.

Mr. KNUTSON. I passed seven or eight of them in Rock Creek Park on Sunday.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is it not a fact that this provision for 14,000 officers is also made because in the event of an emergency the officers are the desirable contingents in the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; because these officers are already trained. They have actual war experience, and it has been demonstrated during the late war that we can raise an effective enlisted force within a very few months' time.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. How many men are to be in the Air Service?

Mr. ANTHONY. The number has not been arbitrarily fixed. There are now 9,000 enlisted men in the Air Service. That number will have to be reduced, if we reduce the total of enlisted men.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. How many civilians will there be in the Air Service?

Mr. ANTHONY. We do not know. There are now 8,000 civilians, but we have materially reduced the appropriation for civilian employees, and they will be cut about 40 per cent.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. That will make about 17,000. How many men will actually fly?

Mr. ANTHONY. The law provides that 90 per cent of the commissioned strength must fly.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. About how many men will that be?

Mr. ANTHONY. There are about 1,000 officers now.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. That is about 17 helpers to 1 flyer?

Mr. ANTHONY. Not quite in that proportion, but I would say to the gentleman that we did find that the Air Service was encumbered with a tremendous number of civilian employees, and in framing our appropriations we did so with the idea that we were going to try to compel the Air Service to fly itself instead of depending upon civilians to get them in the air.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to know what occupation these civilians follow in the Air Service?

Mr. ANTHONY. In the Air Service they are nearly all mechanics. There are a good many laborers, but 2,000 of those civilians are employed at the engineering development plant at Dayton, Ohio, where experiments in aircraft are carried on.

Mr. DOWELL. How many civilian employees have been disposed of in this bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say that if Congress enacts this bill into law the War Department will be compelled to perform a surgical operation on itself and get rid of about 40 per cent of its civilian employees.

Mr. DOWELL. Does that mean that the appropriation is such that it will be impossible for the department to employ these civilians?

Mr. ANTHONY. It will have to cut down its force to come within the money appropriated.

Mr. DOWELL. Or will they employ them and then come in with a deficiency?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will be frank with the gentleman. The committee has not appropriated enough money in this bill for the carrying on of an organization of the present size that the War Department now is, but if these appropriations are enacted into law the War Department will have to cut down the size of every one of the separate bureaus and organizations that compose its activities to bring it within the limitations imposed in this bill. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will find that we have made some changes in the language of the bill, because we have hedged in nearly every paragraph where there used to be lump-sum appropriations with limitations providing that not to exceed certain sums shall be expended for this or that activity. If you enact this bill into law, protected with the language that is carried in the bill, the War Department can not exceed that sum of money, and they must cut down their force to comply with it.

Mr. DOWELL. Then it will be impossible for them to employ these men?

Mr. ANTHONY. It will be, to continue to carry all its present force.

Mr. DOWELL. And then come in with a deficiency?

Mr. ANTHONY. The War Department can only come in for a deficiency for pay of the Army and for subsistence. We must feed and clothe and pay the Army. If they should enlist 280,000 men, Congress would have to provide for that, but in these other activities all through the bill they are limited to the exact sums appropriated.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. FIELDS. I believe the Secretary of War has already directed that the civilian personnel be reduced by at least 40 per cent, has he not?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. I might tell the gentleman a very interesting story there, but I want my colleague, Mr. Cramton, to do that.

Mr. FIELDS. I saw a notice of it in the newspaper.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is very evident that the War Department has profited by the hearings held by this subcommittee, because nearly all of the points brought out along the lines of economy in the War Department have in the last day or two been put into effect under orders by the Secretary of War.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is providing \$5,000,000 for gas in the bill, \$3,000,000 of which—

Mr. ANTHONY. Three million dollars.

Mr. BLANTON. Three million dollars for the Air Service. I want to ask the gentleman—

Mr. ANTHONY. There is not \$5,000,000 for gasoline in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Approximately that.

Mr. ANTHONY. No.

Mr. BLANTON. There is \$3,000,000 for the Air Service.

Mr. ANTHONY. Possibly \$3,500,000 altogether.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, in Texas last week gasoline was selling at 28 cents, and gasoline made a drop of 3 cents in one day, coming down to 25 cents for gasoline. We are paying 30 cents in Washington at this time without any drop. Has the gentleman made any provision with regard to buying its Government gasoline at places where they are able to sell it at 5 cents a gallon cheaper than they do in the Nation's Capital?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is estimated that gasoline will be considerably cheaper in the next fiscal year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The appropriation in the current bill for the present fiscal year for vocational education in the Army is about \$3,500,000. I notice that the item in this bill carries \$1,000,000, only a little more than one-fourth of the amount carried in the existing law, and also there are some rather stringent provisions in here as to the use of that money. Is it the policy of the committee in so greatly reducing that to undertake to destroy, in effect, the system of vocational training in the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman we did not intend to destroy real vocational training, but we do intend to cut out, if we possibly can, this idea of a large Army university. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, before I shall address myself to the matters in which I am interested in this Army bill I want to take this opportunity to express to the House the appreciation of the subcommittee and the appreciation of the full Committee on Appropriations for the magnificent services rendered to the committee, to this House, and to the country by the distinguished chairman who has just spoken to you. [Applause.] This gentleman has given a great deal of very patient attention and hard work to the preparation of this bill. Prior to my going on the committee with him my acquaintance had been a pleasant one, but I have learned to have the very highest regard for his ability, his honesty, and his integrity, and that is the most essential element of a good Congressman in this House. I do not believe that anyone would imagine that this comes from me, a partisan Democrat, in speaking of a partisan Republican, unless I meant every word that I say. He is a man full of the highest aims and purposes and has rendered the country great service in his work and influence on this bill.

Now, something was said a moment ago in reference to the plan adopted by this committee in cutting down the Army bill to 150,000, when the number fixed by legislation of this House a few days ago was 175,000 men. As a matter of fact that legislation was not fixed and did not fix and ought not to fix the size of the Army. I think a majority of the membership of this House were opposed to that measure. Every fair legislator knows that a matter of that much importance ought not to have been brought up under a suspension of the rules, because under the rule you could not vote for a less Army, you could not amend it, and if you voted against the resolution you put yourself in the attitude of voting for the present Army of 282,000 men. Therefore, those of us who believe in a less Army than 175,000 were taken by the throat and compelled to vote for the resolution or be placed in the attitude of voting for a larger Army than 175,000. I do not think that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. KAHN] ought to have brought a matter of that much importance up under suspension of rules, where the debate is limited to 20 minutes on the side, and let the country believe that this House has fixed the Army at 175,000 men when he knows that there is a majority of the Members on this side of the House who would have been glad to have voted for 150,000 or even less. That was the most unfair and most unprecedented method of legislating since I have been a Member of the House. That was for the purpose of throttling the will of the House, and no one knew it better than the gentleman from California. I think it comes with poor grace for any man to now say that that legislation committed the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate money for 175,000 men.

I want to ask some gentleman who does not believe that we have appropriated for a sufficient army what enemy are we

afraid of to-day? Germany lies bankrupt; France is practically bankrupt; England is weighted down with debt; Europe is in no condition to fight a war. In other words, as was stated to you by the chairman of the committee a moment ago, the United States Government is in better condition to fight a war now than it ever was in the history of the country. She has over 4,000,000 well-trained young men who have just come out of the Army. She has material which is estimated by one man to be worth four or five billion dollars besides that which they are actually using. I do not know whether that statement is true or not, but we do know that there is a vast store of material which they have declined to declare a surplus. At any rate, with all of this material, with all of the guns, with all of the small arms, all of the rifles, all of the ammunition, with the magnificently trained officers we have, we are in better shape to fight a war to-day than any nation on the face of the earth. We may thank God that this war only lasted after we got into it for a little over a year, because another year would have made a terrible toll upon the young men of the country and a terrible drain upon the Treasury, because we all know that the war ended just 12 months earlier than we expected. In fact, the peak of resistance was expected to come just about a year from the date the armistice was signed. So I am at a loss to understand how a man could want a larger army than 150,000 men. The truth of the business is that so far as I am individually concerned, unless you can get something for these soldiers to do, I feel that 150,000 are too many. Our own people are now staggering under a load of taxation. When this war broke out the Army was only costing \$100,000,000 a year. The war is over more than a year, and this bill reported by this committee carries the stupendous sum of \$328,000,000, or an increase of over 328 per cent more than when the war with Germany began. Does not this satisfy, gentlemen? What consideration have gentlemen for the overburdened people that they represent? If I could have my way, there would be a more radical reduction of expenses all along the line. The Army produces nothing and the evil is not limited to the number of soldiers taken from the producing class. This is enough, but there is more than this.

That great evil is the enormous number of civilian employees that they have around these camps and cantonments. We were first given to understand it was 100,000 of those people, but a revision in the estimates shows something like 98,000 and odd. But, at any rate, if their last estimate is the true estimate, you will have more men waiting on the Army and the Navy than there will be of fighting men in the 150,000—that is, actual fighting men. If you take those men around the various offices, camps, and training fields that do the work, you will wonder why thousands of useful things might not be done by the soldiers and save millions on top of millions of dollars. These officers and soldiers have too many civilians waiting on them. I believe the Army can be made useful to themselves and made independent, red-blooded men by permitting them to do things for themselves. I do not believe men are improved as soldiers or as men by lying around the camps without having something to do besides drilling and acting soldiers.

They endeavor to make the Army life attractive by moving pictures and all sorts of recreation. I do not know how it is with other people, but I tell you that about the best recreation a man can have is to perform some good, honest toil. It will bring more contentment and satisfaction than drilling a few hours a day and having the recreation furnished at such an expense. I am going to make every Army man angry when he sees this statement, but I would like to hold up to them as a model the United States Marine Corps. The Marine Corps down here at Quantico are not waiting for Congress to appropriate money to improve their homes. They are taking that old camp, those old tumble-down buildings, unsightly affairs, and are taking off their uniforms and are pulling the buildings up on the hills, onto good lots, and are painting them and putting new foundations under them and making attractive homes of them. In the corps there are brick masons, carpenters, paper hangers, and so forth. Those boys are beautifying Quantico. If the Marine Corps stays there a little while they will have beautiful homes. They do this for a very small sum of money. Not over eight or nine hundred dollars. If you were to see those buildings when they get through with them you would think that they cost \$8,000 to \$10,000. But the Marine Corps is willing to go and "take hold of the smutty end of the chunk" themselves. And you ask why the Marine Corps is a favorite among so many Congressmen and so many people of the United States. The answer is that it is because of the spirit displayed by it.

Down at Panama, when the Appropriation Committee was making its annual visits for the purpose of ascertaining the

amount of money to be appropriated for the canal, Gen. Goethals, who is himself of the Army, told us that he had been guilty of misappropriating some funds. He declined to make any explanation until he showed a beautiful place, with fountains playing, with walks laid out, and the barracks all fixed up, and everything clean. Here was the explanation. He said that a committee of marines had come to him and asked him for a little lumber, paint, and cement in order to fix up the barracks, and he gave it to them. He said that he had no authority to do it, but did it. It cost only a few dollars. The result was one of the most beautiful places you ever saw.

Then he took us down to another place, where there were squalid old buildings. The walks were overgrown with vegetation. It was a horrible looking affair. "Now," he said, "I offered to do the same thing for the Army, but when they found out how it was to be done, their expression was, 'To hell with that, if the Government can not fix it up.'" The committee without a dissenting vote indorsed what he had done.

Going back to the Army, I do not believe we are justified in keeping so many civilian employees in performing service that these soldiers could perform, and would be better soldiers by performing. [Applause.] Your subcommittee agrees with that. Mr. Chairman, this Army reorganization bill is the most marvelous piece of legislation ever put together. There was never anything on earth like it. It is so constructed that when you appropriate money it all becomes one appropriation, and is so considered by the Army. It is difficult to put limitations upon it so as to control the items of appropriation, although we have made an effort to do it by limitations on this bill. You may appropriate money for one purpose, and they will take and use it for another.

You might just as well not try to limit the amount of money you are going to appropriate for the Army under this bill, because they will take the money and transfer it from the pay of the Army and for food and clothing of the Army, in which items they are permitted to create a deficiency by law, and use that money for those purposes for which they desire to use it, and then come back to Congress and ask you to give them millions of dollars of deficiencies in the pay of the Army and for food and clothing for the Army. Now, the only thing you have done heretofore, when you make this appropriation, as you have done, is just to write the figures at so many dollars for the Army, for they can convert it into a lump sum. That ought not to be. Congress ought to have control not only of the amount, but we ought to have absolute control of the items for which this money should be expended.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman suggests that Congress should do it. How would you do it?

Mr. SISSON. It is easy. You have got to rewrite your Army bill or allow your Committee on Appropriations to do some legislating. Of course, you are not going to do the latter.

Mr. BLANTON. The committee could have arranged it themselves by placing proper limitations on the appropriation of this money.

Mr. SISSON. Of course, we do not have such distinguished parliamentarians as my friend from Texas on our committee. If we had men like my friend from Texas, we could do all these things, but unfortunately we have no one on the committee, except such men as "Jim" Good, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and Mr. ANTHONY, the chairman of this subcommittee, and a few men of that caliber, and no one can tell how this thing can be done without legislating in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has had wide experience in drafting different appropriation bills for the different departments of the Government. Do we understand that it is only the Army that causes deficiencies or the transfer of items for different purposes?

Mr. SISSON. I do not know. I have not helped to make up the naval bill.

Mr. FISHER. Is it true of all the departments of the Government and not one peculiar to the Army?

Mr. SISSON. It is peculiar certainly to the Army. The Army bill is fearfully and wonderfully made. During the war it was absolutely necessary to have large lump sums, virtually given to the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army, and you are going to do that always when you have war; but in time of peace this bill ought to be sufficiently itemized so that a Congressman when voting can know exactly what he is voting for; else you can not control the appropriations.

Mr. HUSTED. If you cut down the Army from 175,000 to 150,000 men is not there some danger, and is not the opinion of the men who fought our battles for us that you would skele-

tonize the Army down to a point where it would cease to be an effective fighting unit as a whole? In other words, if you had a balanced Army, you would not have enough men in the various services which would be necessary to the Army as a whole?

Mr. SISSON. I must decline to yield further, because I have not the time at my disposal. Further, if my distinguished friend will follow off after experts, he will soon be out in a wilderness and will wander and wander. There is one thing that I am always afraid of, and that is the expert on Army matters, because the expert comes to you and tells you about a skeleton Army, which, of course, means nothing. You may have a big skeleton or you may have a little skeleton. Who is going to determine the size of the skeleton? Is it the man at the head of the Army or the General Staff or the people's Representatives who constitute the legislative department, whose duty it is to assume that responsibility? I am not willing that an Army officer shall determine for me the size of the Army that I think we ought to have. I will listen to him, and I will always say to my friend the Army officer, "I am glad you love a big Army, because you love the service you are in, and if you do not believe in a big Army, you ought not to be in it." But I insist that this Government ought not to be made simply an institution for the support of soldiers. I want it to have something else left for the support of other lines of endeavor. In the past the revenues of this Government have been largely absorbed by the Army and Navy.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. I want to ask another question in regard to the diverting of the funds. The gentleman stated that the Army did not hesitate to divert funds from the purpose for which the Committee on Appropriations had written them in the bill to some other purpose. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not the Comptroller of the Treasury has not something to say about that?

Mr. SISSON. He has a great deal to say about that.

But the Comptroller of the Treasury has got to be controlled by what we write in the bill. You write it in the law and they will show the comptroller that Congress says "we may spend this money." That is what I am criticizing. I did say the Army officer did not hesitate to divert funds in violation of law. I am not criticizing the Army at all. Congress made that law, and that law permits it. The trouble is not with the Army officer but is with Congress, who permits it to be done with so much ease. [Laughter.] I want him to understand, however, that he is not putting it over me. I want him to understand that I at least know what is going on, and I protest against it. It may be that other men may want the Army officer to spend the money as he sees fit and proper, but I want to have something to say as to how I spend my own money, and I think as public officials we should be more particular in spending public funds which are put into our hands than in spending our own money.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I would like to know what functions are performed by the General Staff that could not be just as well performed by others in the Army?

Mr. SISSON. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I am a somewhat prejudiced witness. My observation while on the Committee on Appropriations during the war was that the General Staff served the very magnificent purpose of being the principal "buck passer" of all the Army. [Laughter.] Now, if you try to find out what is done anywhere in the Army you trace it around from the Secretary of War to the General Staff, and when you trace it into the General Staff, there you have lost it. [Laughter.] I have never been able to get any concrete information out of the General Staff at all.

When you ask them about something they will say, "That is under Gen. So-and-so's department." You go to Gen. So-and-so's department, and he will tell you, "I am acting under the General Staff." I do not see that General Staff. It is the hardest thing on earth to locate. If anyone can find that General Staff, I will give him a nice little chromo. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. I had occasion to call up an officer the other day for certain information, and he said that matter was under Col. So-and-so. I hunted up that Col. So-and-so, and he said it was under the jurisdiction of another colonel. I hunted up that other colonel, and he said it was under the jurisdiction of still

another colonel, and altogether I called up six colonels, and the last colonel said it was under Col. So-and-so, and—

Mr. SISSON. And then you got discouraged and got on a street car and gave up the chase? [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. No. Finally the last colonel told me that that matter was under the control of the first colonel whom I had seen, and I called him up again, and he said, "I made a mistake when I first told you it was under Col. So-and-so. I find it is under me." [Laughter.]

Mr. SISSON. Yes. I believe that the Army officers are as honorable men as you and I ever knew. I believe that so far as peculation or dishonesty is concerned, it is the farthest thing from their souls. The training they go through at West Point and their training as Army officers cause them to despise peculation in the Army. But I never saw a bunch of men who were more careless and reckless about the expenditure of money which they think is for a proper purpose than are the Army officers.

Mr. MADDEN. That is because they do not know what money is.

Mr. SISSON. It may be that that is because they are educated at the expense of the Government. As Gen. Goethals once told me in conversation, the civil engineer in private employment has to look after economical methods in order to get contracts, but the Army engineer does not have to look after funds but simply after results, and the consequence is that they never have been trained along economical lines.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman was kind enough to speak of the existing fact that under the forms of the Army appropriation bill Army items can be juggled from one purpose to another, so that the purpose of Congress is often defeated. I wish to say that it was the expectation of the Committee on Military Affairs when it was still an appropriating committee to follow the Army reorganization act with a new draft of the Army appropriation bill, which would accomplish the very things that the gentleman regrets can not be accomplished by a bill reported from the general Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SISSON. You would have to change your Army reorganization bill to do it. But I can not enter into that discussion now.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I only wanted to make it clear that—

Mr. SISSON. I will remind the gentleman that my time is limited.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. At that time we had appropriating power, and now we have legislative power, which the gentleman's committee does not have. Now, you have taken away our appropriating power and lost your power to legislate.

Mr. SISSON. This Congress did it. Men are talking about that matter and criticizing people. Both the Republican and Democratic platforms demanded something like this. But, more than that, a man ought not to get angry solely because it may affect, as he thinks, his standing in the House. Members here ought to be willing to serve the country generally. A man now, if he thinks he loses a little prestige or influence on the floor of the House, becomes angry because the House saw fit to place all appropriations in one committee. But all this evil grew up under the old system. We have done all that you could have done on an appropriation bill. Your committee can legislate now as it could when you made the appropriations. You could not legislate on this bill when you had it. This change was made by the House for the good of the country and not to give a man or a committee prominence in this House.

I do not care personally what you do with it. It is immaterial to me whether you leave the appropriating power here or whether you take it back to your own committee. But while I am on that subject I want to tell you about an unholy alliance that caused it all to be taken away. When the Committee on Appropriations was created in 1866 it had all the appropriations, but when Mr. John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky, was elected Speaker, Sam Randall, of Pennsylvania, was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and there was a faction in the Democratic Party. Mr. Carlisle and Mr. William R. Morrison, of Illinois, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and Mr. Thomas B. Reed, then a distinguished Member of the House from Maine, and the Republicans joined hands with that faction, and voted with Mr. Carlisle and Mr. Morrison and their crowd to curb Sam Randall's power, and to take the power away from the Committee on Appropriations and divide it up among the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and so on.

But there was one man on the floor at that time, a distinguished Member of Congress, and if you want to read a great debate turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and see what was said there. He was the one Republican who had the courage to stand up and make the fight on the floor of the House, and he prophesied what would happen. He said, "This is no time to play politics, and you ought not to play politics with this matter." He told the House then what would be the result. He told them they were going to enter upon an era of extravagance the like of which this country never had seen. That gentleman is still a Member of the House, and he has remained here long enough to see his prophecy literally fulfilled.

He was the one man who was not swept off his feet by partisan politics, but kept his mind constantly open; and knowing human nature, and knowing how men will make a pet of their particular line of legislation that they have charge of, he opposed the change which was made at that time. Go back and read his speech. No man can improve on it to-day. Read his statement as to why there should be one appropriating committee. That speech was made by Uncle JOE CANNON, of Illinois, who is still a Member of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. When was that?

Mr. SISSON. It was shortly after Mr. Carlisle was elected Speaker, and Mr. Randall was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. You can look it up.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am sure my friend from Mississippi does not want to be misunderstood.

Mr. SISSON. No; I do not.

Mr. McKENZIE. I listened to the gentleman's strictures on the General Staff. I want to ask the gentleman, if he had it in his power to write the military legislation of our country, whether he would omit therefrom the provision creating the General Staff?

Mr. SISSON. I would, and I would put the responsibility on the Secretary of War and let him choose his own advisers. That is what I would do, and then I would have him in the shape that the Secretary of the Navy is in. They tried to put the General Staff over on the Secretary of the Navy and he was able to defeat it here in this House.

No; when you begin to divide authority it is too much like the German general staff. I do not like militarism. By the way, before I forget it I am going to discuss something else now, but I want to say that I do not want to reflect upon the personnel of the General Staff. They are very estimable gentlemen. I do not know whether I know many of them or not, because I do not know who are on the General Staff. I do know the Chief of Staff, and one or two more, but I do not know the others when I meet them, and I do not know that anybody else knows them when he meets them. I do not know whether there are 25 of them or 2,500 of them, and nobody else seems to know.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman is willing to admit the fact that the German general staff was a very great military staff?

Mr. SISSON. I am, indeed, willing to admit that, and that Germany was a great military power, but I am still unwilling to convert this Republic into a Germanized, militarized Government, where the soldiery shall control the Government instead of the people controlling it. [Applause.]

Now, I wish to say that in my judgment in this educational movement I see a great deal of danger for Congressmen in the future. The War Department were advertising in the newspapers, but they say they have quit that. They were advertising in papers. They still have the propaganda, and have people out spreading the propaganda, "If you want to get an education, join the Army," that in the Army you may be educated, and that it is the principal thing. Very little is said about military training. I am getting letters, and no doubt you are; and when John Jones, from your neighborhood, enlists in the Army he goes to school, and he writes back to Bill. Bill's mother and father discuss it. They are not able to educate Bill, and they say, "We would like very much to have Bill go to that school."

What is the result? The people back home begin to demand bigger appropriations to enlarge these military schools, and the result is that you enlarge the schools and enlarge the demand for them, the demand for schools supported by State appropriations will cease and State legislatures will be delighted to relieve themselves of that burden, and the result will be that you will gradually have this thing grow so that it will be just as it was in Prussia. That was not a day's growth, and Prussianism was never able to grow until it made the German people realize that the boy was being educated at the expense of the Government. When that was done, first he was trained for seven years, then he got five years, and later they reduced it to three years; and what I fear is, that the people without knowing it are going to begin to demand more money for these

schools. I do not object to the rehabilitation of the boys who were injured in the war. I do not object to spending all the money that is necessary to try to help these boys along the highway of life after they have been wounded and maimed in the war, but I am unwilling that this Government, under the guise of military training, should build up an educational system that will appeal to the people throughout the United States, so that the voters will compel Members of Congress to vote for these great national schools or else they will defeat you. I think there is great danger that in a few years that Prussianism that we fought to destroy will be the system here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. I will take 10 minutes more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question in that connection?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman well knows that for the last year or two the Army has been holding out the inducement under authority of law for young men to enter the Army upon the specific promise that while in the service they will be given the opportunity to secure vocational training.

Does the gentleman think it is right under these circumstances, after they have persuaded the young men to enlist under these promises, for the committee to practically destroy the whole vocational system?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, no; we have not done that in this bill. That is the only reason I did not reserve the right to be against this appropriation, because I want to carry out the contract obligations we are under. But I do not want it to be the permanent policy of the Federal Government. Here is going to be the trouble, under the guise of educating the boy if they keep him three years, as the Pope said about children, "You give me the training of the child until he is 10 years of age and I do not care who has the child after that, I will make him a Catholic." Nothing was ever said truer than that. Nobody knows better than my distinguished friend that if you take a young man and put him in the Army for three years and let him associate with other soldiers, give him their sort of an education, you will find when he leaves he will have a tender heart for the Army, and he becomes a voter in the country for its enlargement and its interest as he was taught to.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. This bill provides \$1,000,000 for vocational training?

Mr. SISSON. It does.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Can the gentleman give us some information regarding some of the witnesses who appeared before your committee? I remember one from Finland and one from Mississippi that had been connected with vocational training.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, yes; I know him very well. He is a fine gentleman. Ah, but I tell you that when you get one of these fellows in this work he is never satisfied. He ought to be engaged in the work enthusiastically or he is not worth anything; but I am not willing to appropriate more money than we are appropriating in this bill for this purpose at this time.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I desire to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he does not believe—for instance, at Camp Lee—that the boys of our country could be given better instruction along agricultural lines than at an agricultural school?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, I never saw any evidence of that. I never saw a boy that wanted to go back to the plow. Our trouble is to induce the boys who were in the late war to go back to the plow. I tell you the Army life does not tend to fit a man so that he desires to go back to the plow. It is all very well to talk about the poetry of the smell of the upturned sod and of the dogwood blossoms, the singing of the birds, the tinkle of the babbling brook, the rattling of the chains, and the whistling of the boy on his mule in the early morn on his way to the field; it is all very nice, but you just try to take hold of plowhandles, get up at daylight, feed the horse or the mule, and by the time the sun gets up take hold of the plow and plow until 12 o'clock; go back and feed your horse, get something to eat, and then get back to work by 1 o'clock, and work until sundown, and it takes all the poetry out of that boy forever. [Applause.]

There is one thing you get that you like and that is by night you have a magnificent appetite and you have a magnificent desire to sleep. But where you get a fellow into the Army camp with the moving pictures and pretty girls coming around to see you, good music, Uncle Sam furnishing the clothes and the meals, you are going to give that fellow a good time, and he will not go back to the plow.

There is no trouble in getting a man to go around over the plantation riding around under an umbrella astride of a horse and seeing the other fellow do it.

But that is not bothering me. What is bothering me in the future is the millions of acres of untilled land, and the boys deserting the farms and agriculture. The man that can solve that problem to-day, the man that can devise some scheme to induce these boys to go back to the farm, so that the boys of the cities may wear high collars, ride in the street cars, see the magnificent business houses, so that the great factories may continue to run—that is all right, but let me tell you the man that can devise a scheme that will bring these boys back to the plow will be one of the greatest statesmen that this country has seen.

Buckle, in his History of Civilization, says that any nation whose agriculture begins to wane is in a dying condition, and he makes this marvelous statement, that no great nation in the past whose agriculture has commenced to wane has ever been able to rehabilitate it and induce the people to go back. Whether that is true I don't know, but if it is true we are in a lamentable condition in America. I believe if you can get some training in the Army to make a man love to plow he will be glad to try it. But if you want to hear a revolutionary cry you put private soldiers to a plow with some captain looking after ten or a dozen and teaching them how to plow. No; they do not want to join the Army to get an education and devote themselves to physical toil and physical work. That is the trouble with the educational system throughout the United States.

We are teaching our boys that the thing to do is to go to school so as to avoid work. They are not willing to do as old Cato did, who resigned his seat in the Senate after he had led the armies of Rome to glorious victory, in order that he might go back and take hold of the plowhandles again.

Mr. CALDWELL. Do I understand the gentleman's argument to tend to the proposition that we should keep the boys in ignorance in order that they might stay on the farm?

Mr. Sisson. I did not say anything of that sort.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is what I gathered from the gentleman's statement.

Mr. Sisson. Oh, the gentleman gathers a great many things that are not true.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman gave me that impression.

Mr. Sisson. I did not give the gentleman anything of the kind. He did not get it from me, and nobody in this House thought that I even hinted at anything like that.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. NEELY. In behalf of historical accuracy, I want to ask my friend if he does not mean Cincinnatus instead of Cato?

Mr. Sisson. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman will read Plutarch's Life of Cato he will find that Cato also was a man given much to plowing; and not only that, but I do not know but that the Cincinnatus story of going to the plow is something of a myth. However, there is no doubt about old Cato.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. NEELY. I wish to say that Plutarch is my authority for the statement that it was Cincinnatus who also left his place to go to the plow.

Mr. Sisson. Well, Plutarch is mighty good authority. I may be wrong in my supposition.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman not admit that both Cincinnatus and Cato were planters—they lived in town?

Mr. Sisson. The story goes that Cincinnatus was called from the plow, and if you will go down here and look at the picture that Brumidi made, you will see Cincinnatus at the plow on one side with Israel Putnam on the other, and Israel Putnam is known to-day more by the fact that he plowed than he is by the fact that he fought in the Revolution, but the fact that he was a plowman made the world understand that a man who plows can fight, and I wish the Army could get that.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, Israel Putnam's fame rests upon the fact that he rode down some stone steps on horseback, and not that he plowed. I know it because I have seen the picture of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Then I shall talk for five minutes longer. I want to show to you gentlemen a very interesting document. Here is the most interesting document that I have seen in some time. Will you gentlemen imagine that in longhand this book which I hold in my hand contains the entire appropriations for the great Federal Government in 1802? I want to read just a few of the items for the sake of Members and especially of those who are complaining about salaries. The total amount

appropriated during that year was \$3,448,147.18. This is not enough now to keep one battleship afloat for one year. I want to read here a most delightful bill of fare for the soldiers on our ships, and I am sure that my friend CALDWELL will not object at all, and if you will keep this bill of fare posted you will not have to use posters costing millions to get men to enlist. The estimate submitted for one ship of war of 44 guns and 312 men for 12 months is as follows:

284 barrels of beef, at \$13.....	\$3,692.00
244 barrels of pork, at \$18.....	4,392.00
83 barrels of flour, at \$10.....	830.00
8,112 pounds of suet, at 8 cents.....	648.96
99,645 pounds of bread, at \$4.....	3,985.80
6,084 pounds of cheese, at 12½ cents.....	760.50
2,028 pounds of butter, at 20 cents.....	405.60
254 bushels of peas, at 87½ cents.....	222.25
16,224 pounds of rice, at \$3.33½.....	540.80
1,014 gallons of molasses at 75 cents.....	760.50
1,014 gallons of vinegar, at 30 cents.....	304.20
7,118 gallons of spirits, at \$1.12½.....	8,007.75
Total.....	24,550.36

The amount carried for the entire support of that ship was \$24,550.36. There are many others here, and you may find them omitting some of their bill of fare, but I have never yet run upon any of these ships that left the spirits out. They seem to have had some fighting spirit along with other kinds of spirit in those days. I want my Republican friends to recall that Thomas Jefferson was then President.

In 1802 the salary of a district Federal judge was \$1,000, and the largest salaries were paid in the States of North Carolina, Virginia, and New York, which were pretty big States in those days, and the salary there was \$1,800 a year. If I had not taken up so much time answering questions, I would have been able to put a good deal more of this historic document into the Record.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. In one moment. As I look over this document and these estimates, I find the activities of the Federal Government were squarely limited at that time to the constitutional powers of the Federal Government. Our activities have now grown so that it is extremely doubtful whether one-half of what we are doing, when tried by the rule of the Constitution, would be held to be constitutional.

In conclusion, let me state that if the appropriations continue in the Federal Government as they have, and the expenditures of our State, county, and municipal governments continue as they have, I believe the total Government expense will be something like \$15,000,000,000 a year in time of peace. I do not know what it costs to keep up the church establishments, but I will presume it costs \$2,500,000,000.

I do not know, nor can the Bureau of Statistics tell you, what the net earnings of the American people are after paying all of their necessary expenses during one current fiscal year. They can tell you how many bushels of corn are produced, and they can tell you how many bushels of corn have been sold, but they can not tell you accurately how much of what a man produces he consumes in his own livelihood. I do not know whether the American people produce net every year more than \$15,000,000,000, but Montesquieu tells you that when the time is reached that the nonproductive or salaried, governmental, or church establishments take more from the people than their net earnings amount to, that nation is doomed to destruction unless you shall reduce expenditures, because it will soon reduce your people to a condition of dire poverty. If \$15,000,000,000 is what will be expended, if you will add the fixed indebtedness of this Government in the shape of interest on our bonds, all of it will amount to something like that.

Therefore, gentlemen of the committee, it is well enough for us to practice some real, genuine, and rigid economy until we can take an inventory of what we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed five additional minutes.

Mr. Sisson. One minute more. Think of the enormous amount of the farms and homes, unimproved real estate, undeveloped mines that are assessed as a part of the wealth of America which produce nothing. If you take the net earnings of the American people I doubt extremely whether it amounts to more than \$15,000,000,000. Now, if it is true any man is not only not a patriot, but he is not a friend of the Army, he is not a friend of the future Army if he will raise this bill one dollar, because the American people are bearing enough burdens at this time to support this enormous Army Establishment even under the appropriations which this committee has granted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 46 minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield some of his time?

Mr. Sisson. Yes; I will yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has only 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. Sisson. I have two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no knowledge of any order by which the gentleman has more than one hour.

Mr. Sisson. Well, I understood we agreed on four hours—two hours to a side.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; the motion was agreed to.

Mr. Sisson. We agreed to four hours.

Mr. ANTHONY. And the gentleman was to have half of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not recollect that order.

Mr. Sisson. I know the gentleman from Kansas made the motion for four hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is clear as to the amount of time fixed at four hours, but the control—

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman from Mississippi was to have half the time.

Mr. Sisson. That was in the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Mississippi controlling half the time?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That was agreed to in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. Sisson. Now, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. [Applause.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to use this time in discussing a feature of this bill which I think of the utmost importance, namely, the conservation and extraction of helium. At the top of page 14 of the bill appears this language, "Experimentation, conservation, and production of helium, \$100,000." Strictly speaking, perhaps, the term "production" is a misnomer. It is contemplated that the helium will be extracted from natural gas rather than produced. But the term "\$100,000," in my judgment, is even more out of keeping with the purpose of the appropriation. It is entirely inadequate.

A few years ago we heard much of the advocacy of preparedness. The necessity for it seemed generally recognized throughout our land. In the two years which are just drawing to a close in our legislative history, we have heard on this floor much debate upon the subject of whether or not we were sufficiently prepared for the great World War. Under these circumstances I feel justified in assuming that I am altogether entitled to uniform bipartisan approval in the sermon of preparedness which I come now to preach, and naturally I expect supporting demonstrations from each amen corner by those who have professed this faith.

I trust that our country may always enjoy the blessings of peace, but history has proven for us conclusively that some nations begin wars and others have wars thrust upon them. What the future may hold in store in this regard is entirely beyond our ken. But it seems that the necessity for a proper preparedness for any contingency which is likely to arise has ever been recognized in the United States. It is this constant policy which makes the conservation of helium a matter of prime importance.

Concerning helium there is much popular misunderstanding. I do not pose as an authority on the subject and have little or no technical knowledge of it, but there are certain practical considerations which a study of it will impress upon the layman at once as of sufficient importance to make its proper conservation imperative. It is from this intensely practical viewpoint that I wish to speak to you. This country has made helium available as a national asset. This Nation has practically a monopoly of the supply. The question is, now that we have determined somewhat the extent of this valuable possession and have established at considerable expense plants for its extraction, shall we surrender these advantages by a policy of legislative indifference?

It is my purpose to endeavor to anticipate your questions and answer them as briefly as I may. The first natural inquiry concerns the discovery of helium and what helium is. It seems that it was discovered by the French astronomer Janssen in 1868 in the surrounding envelope of the sun, and hence was called helium, derived from the Greek word helios, meaning the sun. It was found on the earth by Sir William Ramsay, an English chemist, in 1894 in a gas evolved from certain minerals. Dr. H. P. Cady, of the University of Kansas, in 1907, discovered that a certain natural gas in Kansas contained more than 1 per cent of helium. Further research has been

principally governmental, and I shall acquaint you later with the outlines of its development. Helium is the only known non-inflammable, noncombustible gas which can be used satisfactorily in the operation of balloons. Chemically it is very inert. It can not be ignited and can not be exploded. It is the lightest gas next to hydrogen, with which our balloons and dirigibles heretofore have been filled. Of course, hydrogen is highly inflammable, and the danger due to its use on this account is a source of constant dread. It thus affords a very vulnerable spot for attack. The slightest spark or the penetration of an incendiary bullet would collapse a hydrogen-filled balloon like the bursting of a soap bubble. The helium-filled bag, on the contrary, may be pierced time and again with red-hot bullets without peril either to the balloon or those operating it. Its use thus eliminates that severe strain and tension of the crew, which is naturally incidental to the use of hydrogen, and thereby promotes much greater efficiency. Furthermore, helium, though twice as heavy as hydrogen, has, by reason of its buoyancy, a little more than 92 per cent of its lifting power. The difference in this respect, therefore, is relatively insignificant. For instance, 1,000 cubic feet of pure hydrogen will lift a weight of 75.14 pounds; a similar quantity of pure helium will lift 69.58 pounds. It is now thought that there will probably be absolute safety for aeronautical purposes in a mixture of about 85 per cent of helium and 15 per cent of hydrogen. Such a mixture would have about 93½ per cent of the lifting power of hydrogen, which means that a thousand cubic feet of it would lift 70.18 pounds.

In aeronautics, therefore, the use of helium in times of war is of the utmost importance for the following reasons: First, its wastage through fabrics is but one-half that of hydrogen. And it may be said in passing that this leakage percentage may be greatly reduced by lining the cloth covering of a helium dirigible with what is known as goldbeater's skin, which is made from the intestines of cows. Experiments are being made also to perfect a self-healing fabric. Second, it affords safety for the crew from the ordinary attack against dirigibles. Third, despite this safety, there is no material reduction in the lifting power of a balloon filled with helium. Fourth, it affords mental and physical calmness and corresponding efficiency for the crew by reason of the practical invulnerability of a helium-filled dirigible.

The next pertinent questions concerning helium are, Where is it found and in what quantities? In a very small proportion it is in the air, the estimate being one part of helium to something between 100,000 to 250,000 parts of air. That fact is at present of no practical importance. It has been found also emanating from certain hot springs and from volcanoes, but its principal appearance for practical purposes is in the natural gas of several of the gas fields of the United States. There is a small quantity of helium in Canada, where probably eight or ten million cubic feet a year might be obtained, and a smaller quantity in Tuscany, Italy, but this country has twenty-five or thirty times as much as the remainder of the world. No very considerable quantity has been found in any other land.

It seems that Dr. Cady, to whom I have referred, and one of his associates were the first to find helium in natural gas. That discovery was made in Kansas in 1907. The gas in Kansas bore more than 1 per cent of helium, but the volume of the gas was not sufficient for any very extensive operation. The Bureau of Mines then began to make a diligent survey in an effort to locate available sources of supply. Upon the success of this undertaking has been predicated the whole program of the Government for the conservation and extraction and use of helium. Helium has been found in reasonable quantities in Texas in the Petrolia gas fields; in Oklahoma, all through the Osage and running northeast to the Kansas border; in the southeast part of Kansas, in the Dexter and Sedan fields in particular; in Vinton County, Ohio; in Ontario and Genesee Counties, N. Y.; in Potter and McKean Counties, Pa.; in Randolph County, W. Va.; in Shelby and Hancock Counties, Ind.; and in a few other places. And it is worthy of mention that in these various fields in this country a million cubic feet of helium daily is the estimated wastage into the air.

Now, the Government naturally felt it a duty, in view of the possible uses of helium and our practical monopoly of it, to conserve this supply. In this connection let me call to your attention the fact that a 3,000,000 cubic feet helium-filled dirigible can carry from 70 to 80 tons. Imagine what this would mean in times of war in an invulnerable ship with a cargo of T. N. T. These dirigibles, by the way, are further fortified against attack by being divided into compartments. The engine may be raised near the framework, inasmuch as there is no danger of ignition from the exhausts, as in the case

of hydrogen, and a direct drive is thus afforded. The adaptability of helium to the purposes of observation balloons is also readily apparent.

Feeling this responsibility, the War and Navy Departments and the Bureau of Mines began to think on the best method and most feasible place for beginning the work. I shall recite but very briefly the history of its development. In the gas field at Petrolia, Tex., helium was discovered in a quantity of almost 1 per cent of the natural gas, and because of the volume of gas in that field it was thought a most desirable one for extraction purposes. Two temporary plants for experimentation by two different processes were established at Fort Worth and a third for still another process at Petrolia. This was during the latter part of 1917 and the early part of 1918. These plants were first known as argon plants in order to preserve secrecy of their value as a war agency. Contracts were closed for a supply of the gas with the company in charge of the Petrolia field. The experimentation at Petrolia was by the so-called Norton process. The plants at Fort Worth employed the Linde Co. process and the Air Reduction Co. process, respectively, and were located in that city because of the necessity for more water and more power than was available at Petrolia. From the experimentation at these temporary plants there was extracted about 150,000 cubic feet of helium, and this gas, stored in steel cylinders, was on the dock at New Orleans awaiting shipment to France at the time of the signing of the armistice. Because of the success of this preliminary experimentation the War and Navy Departments, realizing the great importance of a proper supply of helium for military purposes, decided in August, 1918, to build a large extraction plant at Fort Worth to supersede the two temporary ones which had been constructed there. This plant has been completed and arrangements for a supply of the gas from the pipe line have been made, and active operation is to begin March 1, 1921. This plant at Fort Worth has a capacity of from 40,000 to 50,000 cubic feet per day, and I doubt if there is a more complete establishment of any kind in the Government service. The process of extraction of helium in use at this plant—the Linde process—has been established as an absolutely successful one, and helium of 95 per cent purity is obtained thereby. The other 5 per cent is nitrogen, also noninflammable; but I am informed that by reason of improvements in the process the likelihood is that 100 per cent pure helium is an early probability. The plant at Petrolia, with a capacity of from 18,000 to 20,000 cubic feet per day, is due to start extraction June 1, 1921.

Let me assure you that this program is in no sense a matter of sectional pride but, rather, a proposition of national defense. The helium now available from the Petrolia field will likely be exhausted in a few years and these plants moved and established elsewhere. The natural gas of Petrolia is being used constantly for fuel and light in a large city. The necessity is urgent that the helium be extracted from it while it may be had. If we delay our operation the prize of our quest may be gone. The supply must be developed or wasted or shipped out of the country, and the hearings show that an effort has been made by a company to get control of our helium that it may be sent abroad. Let us be alive to this situation and let us not wait to lock our barn after our horse has departed.

The next question is an important and intensely practical one, and that is, What is the cost of extracting helium? Until April, 1918, it is probable that not more than 100 cubic feet of helium had been separated, and that was due largely to scientific curiosity in various laboratories. That separation was at the absolutely prohibitive price of from \$1,700 to \$2,000 a cubic foot. The temporary governmental plants reduced the cost to 40 cents per cubic foot. The Bureau of Mines by its investigations began to blaze a trail toward still cheaper extraction. The report accompanying the Army appropriation bill last year recommended an inquiry into the practicability of securing helium at a reasonable price and in large quantities. Accordingly that investigation has continued, and it is now estimated that the cost of extraction at the Fort Worth plant will be \$56 per thousand cubic feet, 5.6 cents per cubic foot, or about one-seventh of the cost of separation at the earlier experimental plants. This is a little more than five times the cost of hydrogen during the war. If the process being used at Petrolia, which is yet an experimental one, should prove a success, helium may be extracted thereby at twice the cost paid for hydrogen during the war. And in this connection we should not fail to contemplate the cost in lives and the cost in dirigibles from explosions due to the use of hydrogen. Probably you still remember the serious mishaps at Baltimore and Chicago. Everything considered, the elimination of loss of life and property by the use of helium will likely make its use less expensive than that of hydrogen even if the present cost of extraction should not be reduced.

Another natural question is how much would it cost to fill with helium a large dirigible, like the R-34, for instance, which came over from England? The capacity of the R-34 is between two and three million cubic feet; I think, about two and one-half million. To fill it with helium would cost about \$125,000; but the helium may be kept indefinitely and purified when necessary at a nominal cost. This is not true of hydrogen. Compare the utility in war of such a machine filled with helium with the utility of a battleship, and you will see very readily that, for the results that may be obtained, this is comparatively a small expenditure as war costs go. The price of a dirigible, according to my best information, is about \$1 per cubic foot of capacity; the price of the helium to fill it is now a little more than 5 cents per cubic foot. A sufficient number of metal tanks is already on hand at the Fort Worth plant for the storing of eighteen or twenty million cubic feet.

The cost of the development of helium extraction has been borne equally by the Army and Navy. The engineers estimate the annual cost of operation at Fort Worth at \$885,000, and at Petrolia at from \$270,000 to \$300,000. In the estimates an additional sum was asked for leasing certain fields in the United States where helium occurs in order that the supply might be properly conserved. To operate the plants we have established will cost a total of about \$1,200,000, and, as I have intimated, necessary appropriations have heretofore been made on the basis of one-half in the Army appropriation bill and one-half in the Navy appropriation bill. The question is, Shall we now dismantle the plants we have constructed at such expense just when we have finished preparing them for the preservation of this greatest military asset? We have expended about \$7,000,000 in this project—a large sum, but only a fractional part of the cost of a battleship. We experimented long enough to see the feasibility of it, and then we authorized the expenditure of a sufficient sum for the necessary plants and equipment. They are just ready to begin full-capacity operation. Under these circumstances what shall our policy be?

A reduction of the necessary appropriation to run the plants we have established and which are just now completed for operation will mean the shutting down of these plants for a corresponding length of time. Neither the time nor the helium thus wasted can be recovered. The output of wells now in operation is, of course, daily decreasing, and we are gradually being deprived of the greatest known element of air supremacy. It is a national and not a local situation which confronts us. To discourage further development would be a disastrous policy. In the proper preservation of this great asset may rest the surest hope of economy in reducing the great expense necessary to the maintenance of the armed forces of our country. Let us not squander a wealth which seems peculiar to this Nation, but let us properly foster this God-given source of preparedness, which seems to offer a cheaper and more satisfactory solution of many problems of our national defense. [Applause.]

Now I want to call attention briefly, gentlemen, to a few of the items of expense that have already been incurred in order to make it possible to extract helium in the quantities desired. As I have said, we have first satisfied ourselves by experimentation of the possibility and feasibility of the separation of helium from natural gas. Then came the matter of the construction of plants—

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does the gentleman favor the movement that has been on foot to prevent private persons or private organizations from manufacturing helium gas in this country?

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the gentleman that in a sense it is a misnomer to speak of manufacturing helium gas. It is not possible to manufacture helium gas except at really a prohibitive expense. It is the extraction of helium gas—

Mr. McKEOWN. I mean its extraction from natural gas.

Mr. LANHAM. The helium board, consisting of an officer from the Army, one from the Navy, and one from the Bureau of Mines, as well as the gentlemen in charge of the Air Service, are very much opposed to any private commercialization of the helium extraction that may contemplate export.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. One minute.

Mr. Sisson. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. LANHAM. I wish to cite these items of cost which we have already expended:

Cost of Fort Worth plant.....	\$2,123,194
Cost of pipe line from Petrolia to Fort Worth (length of pipe line, 104 miles).....	1,617,952
Cost of contract for conservation of helium.....	1,250,000
Cost of Petrolia plant, about.....	400,000

These plants are just ready to operate, and the question is, gentlemen, now that these outlays have been made and this extraction shown to be feasible, shall we not at least for a period of one year see if this most important proposition is a proper and paying one? [Applause.]

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a quorum here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-five gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. McCLINTIC took their places as tellers.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 64.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ayres	Ferris	Lufkin	Riordan
Bakka	Focht	Lubring	Robinson, N. C.
Baer	Fordney	McCulloch	Rowan
Bell	Freeman	McGlennon	Rowe
Benson	Gallagher	McKinley	Rucker
Blackmon	Gallivan	McKinley	Sabath
Bland, Mo.	Gandy	McLane	Sanders, Ind.
Britten	Ganly	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanford
Browne	Glynn	McLeod	Schall
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Madden	Scott
Burke	Goldfogle	Maher	Scully
Burrhoughs	Goodall	Mann, Ill.	Sells
Campbell, Pa.	Goodwin, Ark.	Mann, S. C.	Sherwood
Candler	Gould	Mansfield	Sims
Cantrell	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Small
Caraway	Hamill	Mead	Smith, Mich.
Carew	Hamilton	Milligan	Smithwick
Casey	Harrell	Montague	Stedman
Clark, Fla.	Harrison	Moon	Steele
Clark, Mo.	Hawley	Mooney	Stiness
Classon	Hays	Moore, Va.	Strong, Pa.
Connally	Hersman	Moore, Ind.	Sullivan
Cooper	Hill	Morin	Summers, Wash.
Copley	Hullings	Mudd	Tague
Costello	Hull, Tenn.	Murphy	Taylor, Colo.
Crowther	Humphreys	Nelson, Mo.	Tincher
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Nelson, Wis.	Tinkham
Davey	Ireland	Newton, Minn.	Towner
Davis, Minn.	James, Mich.	Nicholls	Treadway
Denison	Johnson, Miss.	Nolan	Upshaw
Dent	Johnson, S. Dak.	Olney	Vare
Dewalt	Johnson, Wash.	Pell	Vinson
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Perlman	Voigt
Dooling	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	Walters
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Phelan	Ward
Dunn	Kincheloe	Porter	Watson
Eagan	Kitchin	Pou	Whaley
Eagle	Kleckka	Rainey, Ala.	White, Me.
Edmonds	Kreider	Rainey, Henry T.	Wilson, Pa.
Elston	Lazaro	Reavis	Wise
Emerson	Loneragan	Reed, W. Va.	Wood, Ind.
Field	Longworth	Riddick	Wright

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 15943, the Army appropriation bill, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, whereupon 250 Members answered to their names, and he submitted a list of the absentees for printing in the Record and the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] is recognized.

Mr. ANTHONY. Is the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] prepared to use any more of his time?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would like to use 1 minute, and then the gentleman can use 10 minutes. I yield one minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for one minute.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, the Record of to-day will show that in the course of a colloquy between the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] and the illustrious gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the pending bill, it was stated by the former that Secretary of War Baker was reported to have written a letter in which he alleged that the average cost of maintaining an American soldier in our service in Europe is \$25,000 a year. Of course, the report is not only false but utterly absurd. In order that the statement might not go out to the country unchallenged—and it was not challenged or corrected—I have just called the office of the Secretary, and found the facts in

the case to be as follows: The Secretary wrote a letter to Senator BORAH on January 24, 1921, in which he stated that on September 30, 1920, we had 711 commissioned officers on duty in Europe, and that it was costing the Government, on the average, \$10.76 per day to maintain each of them; and that we had 14,547 enlisted men on duty in Europe, at an average cost of \$3.89 per day for each man.

I make this statement as a matter of simple justice to the head of a great department, that seems, judging from the tone of the debate, without cause to have lost its last friend and for the further purpose of depriving some radical yellow journal of an excuse for printing a preposterous and damaging report as gospel truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation carried in this pending bill for the purpose of vocational training in the Army of the United States for the next fiscal year has been fixed at \$1,000,000. I want to say that while I have been very much interested in this question of vocational education as a general proposition, I am in no way responsible for the existing law with reference to vocational training in the Army, because it was incorporated first in the national defense act of 1916, before I began my service, and it was carried into the reorganization bill passed at the last session of Congress, against which I voted.

But I simply desire to take a little of the time of the committee this afternoon in calling attention to this proposition. If we are going to attempt to carry out the law of the land as passed by the Congress of the United States providing for a system of vocational training in the Army, it seems to me that it is the duty of Congress to make a sufficient appropriation to carry out that law efficiently, and not restrict it to an appropriation of \$1,000,000, as is provided in this bill.

I say that, gentlemen, largely upon this assumption: Since the creation of this system of vocational education in the Army, the War Department has conducted under authority of law a very elaborate system, seeking the enlistment of the young men of the country in the Army, and in practically every one of the posters with which they have placarded the whole country and the whole countryside it emphasizes the opportunity that young men enlisting in the Army will have of securing vocational training in the arts and professions. "Earn while you learn," for instance. I have a number of such placards here that I obtained this morning by request from the War Department.

You will see that every one of these circulars [exhibiting them] offers inducements to young men—in the Veterinary Corps, for instance, to learn the science of veterinary surgery—vocational training at the service stations; and they have made education, travel, and adventure a feature. You will see in every one of these recruiting placards the statement that this proposition of the advantage that the young men will derive from the educational standpoint by an enlistment in the Army is carried out by the War Department under authority of law. They have made a tremendous appeal to recruits. And I dare say, gentlemen, that on that basis more of the young men of the country—and the average age, I am informed, to-day of the recruits in the Army under the reorganization bill is 19 years—I dare say that a great majority of these young men enlisted not under an implied but a specific promise and pledge of the Government of the United States that during the period of their enlistment they would have the benefits of this vocational training.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will yield for a question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I notice the gentleman's statement that the majority of the young men in the service entered in order to get this training. There are now in the service something like 220,000 men, so that a majority would be well up to 110,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I said of those who enlisted since the enactment of the reorganization bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the gentleman any figures on that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; but I know it from my own personal experience and from the inquiries that I have had from my district with reference to this proposition.

Mr. CRAMTON. The total that are getting this training is less than 50,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Suppose it is less than 50,000. I think the actual figures are 48,000, as given in the hearings, in the testi-

mony of Gen. Haan. I believe the gentleman is a member of the subcommittee that prepared this bill, and he can not justify this appropriation on any testimony that was offered in the hearings. It can only be justified on the arbitrary decision of the members of the subcommittee that \$1,000,000 is sufficient to carry out this entire system of vocational training in the Army, and that arbitrary decision was made in the face of all the testimony offered by the gentlemen who appeared before the committee at the instance of the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield further; I do not want to take too much of his time, but in view of the suggestion that the gentleman has made as to the testimony before us, it shows, for instance, without going into other matters, an item of \$3,000,000 for civilian instructors. They want civilian instructors even to teach the boys who want to learn to read and write.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman is talking about estimates, and I am talking about the current appropriation, which provides \$3,500,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. And if you subtract \$3,000,000 even from the estimates, you cut down the estimates close to the million recommended.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman knows that the original estimates of the War Department were for approximately \$11,000,000 on the basis of an Army of 275,000 men. That was later reduced to an estimate of \$5,750,000 plus for the entire work; but I am informed that the testimony of those who were in charge of this work—a work that was placed on them, not by their desire but by the expressed will of Congress a number of years ago when we passed the national defense act—that testimony is that \$3,500,000 is the irreducible minimum with which they can carry on this work decently for the next fiscal year.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will yield to the gentleman from Wyoming in a moment, if I have the time. I do not know what policy Congress is finally going to decide to follow in reference to this vocational training for the Army. It may be a mistake to have inaugurated it at all. I think it is a mistake to enlist illiterates in the Army of the United States and then assume the burden of educating them after they have been enlisted. I think that is a mistake, and I think the members of the Military Committee ought to bring in legislation here that would absolutely prohibit the enlistment of any illiterate in the Army of the United States, because to-day they have got at least 10,000 men enlisted in the Army who are absolutely illiterate, and I do not think we ought to assume the burden of giving those men a primary education, but I think that burden ought to rest on the local State authorities. But the point I am making, I will say to the gentleman from Wyoming, is that we have entered upon this policy. These young men have been induced to go into the Army on the strength of the assurance that they would be given this character of training, a high standard of vocational training, while they are serving out their enlistment; and it seems to me that the committee have unduly and arbitrarily reduced the amount below what it ought to be to put into effect the real purposes of the existing law on this subject. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sorry I did not have time to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. Sisson. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation of about \$328,000,000 for the Army and about \$6,000,000 for the Military Academy is the most reasonable one we have had in several years. Still this amount is too high.

An Army cut to 150,000 men is certainly, in my judgment, a necessity of the times. The resolution that the House and Senate passed making it 175,000 men might have been put through for reasons best known to the steering committee and to the War Department, but this House is coming up now with an appropriation for an Army of only 150,000 men, and that is a little paradoxical.

If the gentleman from Kansas can carry out his guaranty that after the 4th of March the Army will be reduced and by July it will be 175,000 and by next January it will be 150,000, we still will be bound to come forward at some later period with a deficiency appropriation. All this camouflage about what we are saving when it is manifest deficiency bills must be passed at the next Congress can not deceive the public pocketbook. The people of the United States call upon every public servant they have for economy in government. No longer than this morning, with already \$47,000,000 available, there was a motion made to recommit the river and harbor bill and add to the \$15,000,000

which it carried \$13,000,000 more. Some pork-barrel statesmen said, "Let us vote for it." I believe, gentlemen, when we talk here for economy we ought to vote economy, and I am one Democrat who is going to join with you Republicans if you will stand for economy so soon as President Harding comes into the White House. [Applause.]

Already the people of the United States are groaning under heavy taxation. With the State and county assessments, the city government added to it, it makes the local taxation nearly one-sixteenth of the real value of the property. Six or six and a half per cent every year is not uncommon in this country for taxation. You add on to that the high expense of the Federal Government, reaching out with all its activities and additional calls upon Congress to put some new grabbing scheme on the statute books. What can the people of the country expect? It is time for the American Congress to measure up to the standard and call a halt, and say we will make the tax legislation of this country commensurate with the public ability to pay.

Who believes that the United States is in danger and is in need of a great standing Army now? Local papers in every county in the United States contain the statement that boys are still being enlisted in the Army of the United States when Congress, by positive resolution, has called attention of the department to the fact that 175,000 is all that the Government will stand for. Yet they are going into the Army, and the bills must be paid. I do not know if the Secretary of War has official knowledge of what this Congress intends to do. We say we will have 150,000 soldiers and a resolution stated that it should be 175,000. What will the new Secretary of War understand by it? Will the gentleman from Kansas be able to carry out the guaranty that 150,000 will be the maximum? Is he in a position to say what the new Secretary of War will stand for? Congress must decide on what this shall be. Reaching out with all this vocational education endeavoring to make a primary school out of the Army is a very costly attraction to the youth of the country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman want the House to understand that he thinks the bill does not carry sufficient appropriation?

Mr. QUIN. I know that Congress will be called on at the next session to bring forth a deficiency for the Army. [Applause.] And the gentleman standing there knows it just as well as he knows that the stars are fixed in the heavens. We know that it is impossible for an army of 232,000 men to be reduced by the 1st of July, 1921, to 150,000 men. With all this great crowd of officers, with this expensive grabhook reaching out, with this very bill carrying these activities, with a large number of civilian employees to carry on certain work that the soldiers ought to do in the cantonments or camps all over the United States, how do you expect to get along on \$328,000,000? So far as I am concerned, I am going to tell gentlemen the truth. I know that \$328,000,000 is not going to be sufficient when you have on the books a resolution for 175,000 men.

Mr. KNUTSON. Who employs these civilian employees that the gentleman complains of?

Mr. QUIN. The General Staff directs the policy. You have not cut them out; you can not cut them out right away. They are laborers, professors, and such like; they are going to stay, and as one gentleman said he was afraid that we were going to have too much of a skeleton army. He was afraid that we would not have a great organization, he was afraid that we were not going to have enough Infantry to go out and kill people. That is what he is scared of. The skeleton army seems to be the want of the General Staff; they want a chemical division; they want a division for everything, even the supervision of all the little vocational gardens in the country. We have reached out, we have got out of the general purpose of the Army of the United States when established to create different potentialities that were never contemplated and that are costing the taxpayers of this Government huge sums of money.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield further. The trouble is that every department of the Government is costing in the same relative proportion, and as my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] stated on this floor, the people are bearing the burden. The cost of Government expenses and all the corollaries equals the net earnings of all the people of the United States, according to the best estimates we can make. Where are we going to end? Some folks say that we are going to take off taxes. Who believes that you will ever be able to take off taxes with the present high cost of Government and with all of these bonds that we have issued requiring a sinking fund to be laid aside, and the interest to be paid upon them? Who believes, with your

maternity bill and the Smith-Towner and every other bill that is going to cost millions of dollars, that you are going to reduce taxes? Who believes that you can reduce the taxation when you keep adding on activities which will be bound to reach up into the billions of dollars? [Applause.]

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Blanton].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] would have the country believe that the great Military Affairs Committee, notwithstanding the fact that its appropriating power has been lodged in some other committee, is impotent; that it does not know how to draw matters of legislation of the simplest kind. He admits that the War Department is constantly using the funds appropriated for one purpose by Congress for other purposes and that it continues to transfer those funds at will and against the wish of Congress and against the will of the Military Affairs Committee. I do not agree with him in his insinuation that the Military Affairs Committee can not stop it. I know, and he knows, that if the Committee on Military Affairs wants to stop that it has the power of legislation now to bring in a measure to-morrow and to get a rule from the Committee on Rules—

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Right there I want to say—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, let me first finish my sentence. I do not want the gentleman to stop me in the middle of a sentence—the Military Affairs Committee could bring in a measure to-morrow if it wanted to, and if it had enough influence with the steering committee it could get a rule from the Committee on Rules making it in order and could pass it here in 30 minutes stopping the War Department from doing these very things that the gentleman from Mississippi says it does; but the committee does not want to do that. I yield.

Mr. ANTHONY. The evil that the gentleman speaks of came from the practice of Congress permitting in the old appropriation bills what are called lump-sum clauses, where three or four different items are combined into one sum for the purpose of accounting. If he will read over the bill—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman has had an hour and I have just five minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman let me finish?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I can not afford to give my little five minutes up to a gentleman who has spoken for an hour. I am not talking about what has been in the past, but I am talking about what is in front of us now. If this committee wants to stop this practice, why does it not do it?

Mr. ANTHONY. It has done it.

Mr. BLANTON. I can draw a provision in 15 minutes, if they will bring it in and get a rule and make it a law, that will stop the War Department and the Chief of Staff from transferring these funds at will, stop them from spending money for purposes Congress does not design. It is all with Congress. The trouble is with Congress and this great Military Affairs Committee. The members in authority have too many pets among the high Army officers. The Chief of "Staff" and his various lieutenants can come in here before the prominent members of the Military Affairs, Appropriation, and steering committees and get what they want, usually. They can bring influence to bear upon each one of them and make them do something they do not want to do. If that is not the case, why do they not stop it? The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Mondell] knows how to stop it if he wants to, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madden] knows how to stop it, if he wants to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Mondell].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the War Department has charge of a service of public defense. Upon the War Department rests the duty of guarding and protecting the Republic, and a department charged with obligations, duties, and responsibilities of that kind can not be absolutely circumscribed and held to close and definite bounds in its expenditures. There is no one here, not even the gentleman from Texas who has just taken his seat, who would vote for a provision of law under which just so much and no more could be expended for the pay of the Army, no matter what happened.

Mr. BLANTON. I would, and stop there.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, the gentleman from Texas is not utterly regardless of the welfare of the Nation, and in case of invasion, in case of an emergency which required the enlistment of an additional number of men, he would not be willing to take a chance. I am certain he is not unmindful of the public welfare.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am not.

Mr. MONDELL. Then the gentleman would not vote for that kind of a provision, in my opinion; he would not vote for a provision which allocated every item of expenditure for any department of national defense and left it absolutely without any option or opportunity to use a certain portion of funds other than those appropriated for a definite purpose for that purpose if the emergency required it. We can not bind these services down as we do a civil service to the expenditure of just so many dollars and no more. The nature of the service is such that Congress can not take the responsibility of saying to a dollar what the War Department shall have for Army pay, what it shall use for transportation, what shall be the outlay for food. There must be some leeway and discretion. [Applause.] There must be opportunity for expansion in case of emergency, and because that is so, because the Congress can not and should not too closely bind and circumscribe and limit the expenditures of such a department, the responsibility resting upon those at the head of those departments is all the greater not to expend beyond the amount allotted and provided by the Congress for any particular purpose unless there is a national emergency demanding it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. May I have five additional minutes?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. And that, Mr. Chairman, is what makes the action of the Secretary of War in enlisting at great cost many thousands of men far beyond the number contemplated by Congress when it passed the appropriation bill so reprehensible. We can not put the Secretary of War in jail for having done that, because we can not, in view of a possible emergency, bind him absolutely as to his expenditures, but, knowing what the Congress contemplated, knowing as he did know just how many men the appropriations he had would pay, knowing, as he himself stated, that there was nothing in the way of an emergency either at home or abroad compelling or suggesting an increase above the number of men which Congress appropriated for, the Secretary is subject to the severest condemnation for having pursued the course he did. Now, in this bill the committee has gone further than committees have gone in the recent past in attempting to segregate items and in attempting to allot and allocate them so as to avoid the temptation to using them for purposes other than those contemplated by the Congress. It has made a distinct advance in that regard; some may think that the committee is subject to some slight criticism for having gone further in that regard than we have in the past, and possibly so far as to involve the danger of hampering the department in case of emergency. I do not think they have, but, as far as the committee has gone, there are still opportunities under an appropriation for the Army for abuse. But, great heavens, have we reached that point in the affairs of the Republic that we can not trust an executive officer in the slightest degree?

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman just reached that point a few moments ago in his statement that he could not trust the Secretary of War.

Mr. MONDELL. Could not what? My query is, Have we reached the point where we can not trust an executive officer to exercise a discretion that is essential for the welfare and safety of the Republic?

Have we reached the point where we must so bind down the Secretaries of War and Navy that in case of emergency the welfare and safety of the Republic might be threatened? I deny that we have reached that condition. Unfortunately we have had woeful abuse of executive discretion under this administration, but I decline to charge it to the Democrats of the country, because I do not believe they approve it, and I do hope that under a new administration we will have men in charge of these affairs that will realize their responsibility to the people of the Republic. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Volk].

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirteen gentlemen are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Volk] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. VOLK. Mr. Chairman, in fact the whole program seemed to be one of suppression and oppression, to silence the wrath

and indignation of every branch of the community. Newspapers were even warned that their utterances might produce dire results, all for the purpose of preventing just and proper criticism of the extraordinary action of the court and the receiver in the litigation.

Two years have elapsed and not a thing, save what will be hereinafter referred to, has been accomplished through this receivership. To-day the matter is practically where it was two years ago. In the meantime the disintegration of this system was begun—transfers have been abolished, cars have been withdrawn, lines have been discontinued, to the end that by suspension of branches of the service an extra fare is being charged for transit through this borough. The city of New York, in desperation of the breakdown of the transportation system, introduced the operation of busses. These busses gave extraordinary service and were a source of great satisfaction to the people. The receiver made application for and obtained an injunction stopping the operation of busses, and the people of Brooklyn must be satisfied with only such services as the receiver of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit system is willing to accord them.

There should be no misunderstanding of the transit situation in the city of New York. This company, with others, is under a contract obligation with the city to transport passengers within the city for a 5-cent fare. This contract and its validity have been established by the courts. To circumvent this contract and deviate from its plain terms and provisions has been the work of this receivership, and it is not transcending a truthful statement of the situation to say that that was in the minds of the actors when the litigation was begun.

Branches of this system, which have been in existence for years, and which have been and now are indispensable to the welfare of citizens of this center of population, are being suspended upon the pretext that they do not pay and must be discontinued because the operation of them represents a losing venture. This can not be true. For years the lines which have been suspended have been actively and intensively used by the people. They traverse the most populous part of the borough. Their suspension is a mere club designed to aid in the propaganda now being conducted for a higher rate of fare in the city. No one can gainsay the claim advanced by the receiver that these roads do not pay, since no one would have the courage to demand the truth in the matter, in view of the previous attitude of the United States court in its treatment of those who questioned its action.

The result is that to-day numerous branches of the system have been suspended and the threat is now made that a large number of other branches will be suspended from operation in the very near future. All this is done under the guise and pretense of economy, the claim being made that the branches do not pay and that a discontinuance is made necessary by reason of the loss incurred in operation. Upon that point permit me to direct attention to something that has just come to the notice of the public in connection with the administration of the system.

The receiver of the corporation, Lindley M. Garrison, is shown to have had paid to him and his assistant \$125,000 as partial payment for his services for one year. In addition, and in order further to bolster up this claim that the transportation system represents a losing venture, it paid \$133,000 to so-called experts for a valuation of the system. In other words, so far as the public have been able to get at the records of this receivership for one year, it has shown that \$258,000 or more had been expended for a purely nominal service of a receiver. Think of it, \$125,000 as partial payment for one year's services of a receiver who is a resident of another State, who possibly seldom, if ever, visited Brooklyn before his appointment, who is not a traction man, and who is not familiar with traction matters, particularly those of the Borough of Brooklyn. In addition, a payment of \$133,000 for an appraisal that never was needed and should never have been undertaken as an incident to the receivership. In fact, these items are clearly illegal and without sanction or authority in law, yet both items were sanctioned by direct orders of the court under circumstances that certainly ought to be questioned by anyone interested in an economical administration of the affairs of this company, which is filling the air with cries and lamentations that it is not making money.

It must be borne in mind that the receiver, Mr. Garrison, is in no sense devoting his time and attention exclusively to the work of the receivership. If reports are to be credited, he is conducting his law business in the usual manner, and the management and administration of the transportation system is in the hands of precisely the same force, including its president, as

has administered it for years past. There is no change in the personnel of the real managing and administering force of the company. From this it will be perceived that the receivership is a mere nominal one. The payment of \$125,000 to him and to his assistant must shock anyone who understands the situation in connection with this company. With the aid of the court, on one hand it holds in check the people who have had disaster brought to their fireside by its negligence, while with the other hand it bestows largess and bounty upon those who have done nothing and have added positively nothing of value to it. And in this, the aid and agency is the district court of the United States, which under the mantle of equity, the maxim of which is "conscience, good faith, and reasonable diligence," has sanctioned this practical looting of the treasury of this company, and yet this may be only a detail of what has been disposed of through this equitable receivership, so called. The real amount which has been abstracted from this company under the forms of law and the orders of the court can not be learned until some agency of investigation undertakes the work of ascertaining it. The attitude of the public of the city of New York can not be misunderstood. In the city of New York, certainly in the Borough of Brooklyn, with its 2,000,000 of people, since the day war was declared, nothing has aroused the public so much as this shocking state of affairs and the maladministration which it indicates. There is no division of sentiment in regard to what should be done. Everything connected with the inception and progress of this litigation has branded it as opposed to public interest and a scheme to throw a mantle of legal protection around the conduct of the affairs of the company, and thus the acts of the receiver are kept screened from public scrutiny. The public demand that it should be exposed. Recently the Brooklyn Rapid Transit system, in unison with other transportation lines in the city, made application to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment for an increased fare.

The board began public hearings to determine the justice of the company's demand. These public hearings resolved themselves into an investigation which proceeded only far enough to show the demoralization of the company due to the receivership when the application was suddenly withdrawn and forced a discontinuance of the investigation. The experience of the comptroller of the city of New York shows that exposure can not come through any agency except the Congress of the United States. A committee of the New York State Legislature, composed of senators and assemblymen of the affected borough, made a formal and written application for an appointment with the court for a conference on the question of the termination of the receivership, which was diplomatically declined on the ground that the occasion did not warrant it.

No legislative—State or municipal—agency can undertake this inquiry and investigation, in view of what has transpired and in view of the attitude of the United States court. The sole means by which the public can be enlightened upon this all-important matter is the privileged investigation which a committee of Congress alone can conduct. The honor of the courts of the United States appears to be involved in this matter.

The litigation, collusive in its inception, has been imposed upon the courts of the United States. It has been termed by the parties themselves "a friendly receivership." It has been prolonged for two years, to the end that this receivership might continue and the people of the Borough of Brooklyn harassed and oppressed thereby. If the courts of the United States are not to be a hissing and a byword, this species of maladministration must be exposed and summarily dealt with. The means at hand should be availed of at once if the honor and dignity of our courts are to be upheld and the respect to which they are entitled perpetuated in the minds of the people. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHLBACH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15943, the Army appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

FIRST STATE BANK OF KERRVILLE, TEX.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, I call from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7050, and I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 7050) for the relief of the First State Bank of Kerrville, Kerr County, State of Texas.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The question being on concurring in the Senate amendment, the amendment was agreed to.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House dispense with Calendar Wednesday business tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader give us some idea of when we may reach private bills and other bills on the Private Calendar?

Mr. MONDELL. I hope very soon after we dispose of the appropriation bills. There are only two more.

Mr. SEARS. Then you think we will have some chance to reach those bills?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. FRENCH, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John W. Reddington (H. R. 8332), first session, Sixty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Messrs. GOODALL, WHITE of Maine, PETERS, and HERSEY, for three days, for the purpose of attending the funeral of the governor of Maine.

To Mr. CANDLER, for last Saturday and this week, on account of serious illness in his family.

To Mr. FOCHT, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

To Mr. ASHBROOK, for two weeks, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 2, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

385. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting annual report of that corporation for the year ending December 31, 1920; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

386. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of information in response to House resolution 648 in connection with the purchase of German airplanes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

387. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Plymouth Harbor, Mass. (H. Doc. No. 996); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with map.

388. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting annual reports for the year ending December 31, 1920, for that corporation and the Washington Interurban Railway Co., the City & Suburban Railway Co., the Georgetown & Tennytown Railway Co., and the Potomac Electric Power Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

389. A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting annual report of the corporation for the year ending December 31, 1920; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

390. A letter from the chief clerk of the Patent Office, transmitting annual report of the Commissioner of Patents for the year ending December 31, 1920; to the Committee on Patents.

391. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting requested item for consideration in the deficiency appropriation bill, in connection with the case of Kristina Furrack; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1274); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to exempt the New York State Barge Canal from the provisions of section 201 of House bill 10453, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1275), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WARD, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 444), authorizing the President to require the United States Sugar Equalization Board to take over and dispose of 13,902 tons of sugar imported from the Argentine Republic, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1276), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. IGOE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15916) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1277), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4039) to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes," reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1278), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15953) further regulating the granting of visés by diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1280), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KEARNS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13756) for the relief of William Thomas Matingley, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1279), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 15963) to amend and reenact the first paragraph of subdivision (a) of section 200 of the transportation act, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 15964) to authorize deduction of war-risk insurance premiums from the war-service bonus payable under the act approved February 24, 1919, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 15965) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Pearl River, between Pearl River County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 15966) authorizing an appropriation for continuing irrigation and drainage on the Yakima Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PARK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 464) providing for the monetization of the bonds issued by the United States of America during the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 465) for the appointment of one member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging naval defense for the Puget Sound country; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring a tariff on all flower, vegetable, and other agricultural seeds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, favoring a bill for the promotion of Gen. Crowder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging the passage of House bill 15372, regarding the leasing of certain oil lands in Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, favoring the passage of a bill authorizing the Secretary of War to turn over to the Secretary of the Treasury for the use of the Public Health Service the military reservation at Fort Logan H. Roots, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, requesting an appropriation to provide for the prompt and complete construction of locks and dams in the Ouachita River, according to the War Department plans, to insure permanent navigation from Camden, Ark., and New Orleans to the Gulf; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging adoption of the Wadsworth resolution to discontinue Federal operations on the canal system of that State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: Memorial of the Oregon State Legislature relative to the hospitalization and retraining of disabled ex-service men; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOMINICK: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, urging Federal aid for post roads in South Carolina; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, favoring legislation for ex-soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 15967) granting an increase of pension to Loudica Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15968) granting a pension to William H. Grimes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15969) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Lofton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15970) granting an increase of pension to Angie E. Leslie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 15971) for the relief of Joseph A. Willens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 15972) granting a pension to Mattie J. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5389. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Bakersfield (Calif.) Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, relating to the Curtis-Dyer antilynching bill, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5390. By Mr. BURROUGHS: Petition of Miss E. M. Newell, corresponding secretary of Woman's Club of Hanover, N. H., indorsing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5391. Also, petition of B. M. Stovall, secretary Midcity Citizens' Association, indorsing House joint resolution 11; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5392. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of St. James Parish, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring recognition of the Irish republic by our Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5393. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Rotary Club of Key West, Fla., favoring the enactment of House bill 14899; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5394. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, opposing blanket appropriations for rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5395. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolutions of American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of Massachusetts, John F. Harrigan, president, protesting against deportation of Lord Mayor Donal O'Callaghan, of Cork, Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5396. Also, resolutions of Roger Casement Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, Jeremiah Carroll, chairman, appealing to Congress to demand payment of loan to England; also send home the British ambassador, Sir Eric Geddes, as a protest against the crimes of the British Government in Ireland; also to recognize the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5397. Also, resolutions of Roger Casement Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, Jeremiah Carroll, chairman, protesting against deportation of Lord Mayor Donal O'Callaghan, of Cork, Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5398. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of Export and Import Board of Trade, Baltimore, Md., opposing Senate bill 4542; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5399. Also, petition of the National City Bank of Baltimore and the Jacob C. Shafer Co., both of Baltimore, Md., opposing the Gronna bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5400. Also, petition of the Canton Lumber Co., Baltimore, Md., relating to appropriation for rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5401. Also, petition of Robert S. Hart, Baltimore, Md., favoring turnover tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5402. By Mr. MCARTHUR: Petition of the University of Oregon, School of Journalism, asking a Federal investigation of the paper industry of Oregon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5403. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Local No. 390, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, of New York, protesting against the order which abolished special clerks in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5404. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of residents of Suttons Bay, Mich., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French Negro troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5405. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of the United Commercial Travelers of America, Euclid Council, No. 421, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring 1-cent letter drop postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5406. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of prominent citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against bill which provides for severe restrictions regarding work and enjoyment of innocent pastimes on Sunday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5407. By Mr. REBER: Petition of the Pennsylvania Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, favoring a reduction of the Navy building program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5408. Also, petition of the Pennsylvania branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, relating to military expenses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5409. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of about 150 farmers in western North Dakota, favoring the immediate passage of House bill 15453, guaranteeing a price of \$2.26 per bushel for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5410. By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, opposing any tariff on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5411. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Queen's Daughters, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5412. By Mr. YATES: Petition of parent-teachers' associations of Decatur, Ill., urging an appropriation for the continuation of work against venereal diseases, by Mrs. Mary T. Starr; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5413. Also, petition of the National Board of Marine Underwriters, New York City, urging the passage of House bill 13591; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5414. Also, petition of W. S. McKee, president American Manganese Steel Co., Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the McFadden bill (H. R. 13201); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

5415. Also, petition of Tanners' Products Co., Chicago, Ill., strongly in favor of an appropriation by the Government to help

defray the cost of transporting food to be sent to the starving people of Europe; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5416. Also, petition of W. B. Taylor, Chicago, Ill., urging legislation protecting the lemon and citrus growers of this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5417. Also, petition of Bay & River Boat Owners' Association, San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 13591; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5418. Also, petition of A. F. Wine, of the American Cooperative Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of the Fess-Capper bill (H. R. 12652); to the Committee on Education.

5419. Also, petition of the Chicago Clearing House, by Mr. Thomas C. Stibbs, favoring Senate bill 3374, relative to a 2-cent piece; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

5420. Also, petition of Kendall County Farm Bureau, Yorkville, Ill., favoring the French-Capper truth-in-fabric bill (H. R. 11641); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5421. Also, petition of F. R. Warner, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., urging the passage of House bill 13591; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5422. Also, petition of the Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association of America, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 15746; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5423. Also, petition of Elgin Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill., urging the passage of the Jones-Randall bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5424. Also, petition of Will County Women's Christian Temperance Union, Joliet, Ill., urging the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5425. Also, petition of C. H. Perkins, Decatur, Ill., favoring the passage of the Elkins bill (S. 4596); to the Committee on Pensions.

5426. Also, petition of Ottawa (Ill.) Rotary Club, urging speedy justice to disabled soldiers now subject to delay; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5427. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of James A. Kelland Post, No. 111, of Blinford, and William Whalen Post, No. 101, of Leeds, both in the State of North Dakota, of the American Legion, regarding legislation for disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5428. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of the Wednesday Club, Sandy Spring, Md., and the A. Y. L. I. Club, Germantown, Md., favoring the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5429. Also, petition of Current Comment Club, Forest Glen, Md., favoring the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5430. Also, petition of Golden Rule Council, No. 6, Junior Order United American Mechanics, relating to the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 2, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., the Chaplain, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee that our times are in Thy hands; and with such custodianship and direction we would ask Thee to help us to conform our lives to Thy good pleasure. As we live and labor may we honor Thee, seek the best interests of our beloved land, and the furtherance of Thy kingdom through the earth. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, January 31, 1921, when, on request of Mr. McCUMBER and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

LINCOLN MEMORIAL (S. DOC. NO. 372).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the chairman of the Lincoln Memorial Commission, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$363,000, required for the completion of the Lincoln Memorial in West Potomac Park, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INLAND TRANSPORTATION BY STAR ROUTES (S. DOC. NO. 371).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Postmaster General, submitting a supple-

mental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$1,363,000, required by the Post Office Department for inland transportation by star routes, payable from postal revenues, for the fiscal year 1921, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSPORTATION OF MAILS (S. DOC. NO. 373).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Postmaster General, submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$65,575,832.03, required by the Post Office Department for transportation of the mails by the United States Railroad Administration during the 26 months of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioner of Patents, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the commissioner for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

CAPITAL TRACTION CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Capital Traction Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CITY & SUBURBAN RAILWAY OF WASHINGTON.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the City & Suburban Railway of Washington for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

GEORGETOWN & TENNALLYTOWN RAILWAY CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

WASHINGTON INTERURBAN RAILROAD CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Washington Interurban Railroad Co. for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

GEORGETOWN GAS LIGHT CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7050) for the relief of the First State Bank of Kerrville, Kerr County, State of Texas.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15935) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.